


# PREFACE

THIS book owes its existence to the Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Dr A. A. Macdonell, who suggested to me the writing of it, and who secured its acceptance for publication by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. Professor Macdonell was also so good as to read the proofs of the first three sheets before he left England in 1907 for his tour in India, and for this and all the other help he has given me in the course of my Sanskrit studies I desire to express my most sincere thanks.

The editing of the text has been rendered possible for me by the liberality of the India Office and of the Royal Asiatic Society, which lent to me the manuscripts on which the text is based. To the Secretary of the Society, Miss Hughes, and to the Librarian of the India Office, Mr F. W. Thomas, I owe grateful acknowledgements of the assistance afforded me in this and other ways.

I have tried by the translation and commentary to extract as much as possible from the Aitareya Āranyaka, as I recognize that a text of this class should as far as practicable be made by its editor to yield all that can be derived from it for the knowledge of the period when it was produced. With this end in view I have added a series of Indexes which contain in great fullness the lexical material of the work while the material will also serve for grammatical purposes, as in each case the precise form which occurs is specified. I need make no apology for the distinction made between the Mantra, the Aranyaka, and Sutra forms; not to distinguish the different strata of the text would be merely misleading.

In the commentary I have tried to avoid repeating what can easily be found in such standard works as the *St Petersburg Dictionaries*, Colonel Jacob's *Concordance* to the Upanisads and Deussen's treatise on the *Philosophy of the Upanishads*. Nor have I thought it worth while to note in detail the verbal coincidences between the Aitareya Brahmana and the Aranyaka. As might be expected they are constant and show unmistakeably the connexion of the two works. Some other points arising out of the book I hope to deal with elsewhere.

I had not originally any intention of including in the book the text of a portion of the Sānkhayana Aranyaka which now forms the appendix I hoped that Dr Friedlander would complete his projected edition of that text, and it was only after a considerable portion of the book was in type that I learned that there was little or no prospect of the appearance of an edition at any early date I then obtained the permission of the Delegates to print so much of the text of the Śankhayana as was unpublished, and the Royal Asiatic Society were so good as to include a translation of the whole Aranyaka in their series of Oriental Translations, and to publish an article of mine on the Śankhāyana Aranyaka in the Journal of the Society for 1908 The translation and the article will be found to supplement in some important points *the information as to the Sānkhayana contained in this book*

The printing of the work has occupied over two years, and has entailed a good deal of trouble on all those concerned with it I desire to express my thanks to Mr R W Chapman, of the Clarendon Press, for the interest which he has taken in it and for valuable suggestions which he has made from time to time on points of form It gives me also much pleasure to acknowledge the great pains taken by the Oriental Reader of the Clarendon Press, Mr J C Pembrey, Hon MA of Oxford, in dealing with the proofs. For such errors as remain I must accept responsibility This is the fourth book of mine which has had the advantage of Mr Pembrey s care and skill, and I feel that it would be difficult to exaggerate the value of his assistance

A BERRIEDALE KEITH

LONDON
June 11 1909




# CONTENTS

# THE AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA

## INTRODUCTION

### I The Text

WHEN, in June 1905 I commenced preparations for the production of an edition of the Aitareya Āranyaka, I was mainly influenced by the expectation raised in part by the reference in Prof Buhler s Report[1] on his Kashmir journey to differences in the text in a birch bark MS, that it might be possible to amend considerably the text of Rajendralāla Mitra's edition Rajendralala used only two complete MSS of the text, and three of Sayana s commentary, besides three other MSS of parts of the text or commentary and it seemed reasonable to suppose that the employment of additional MS material would add to the correctness of the text This expectation has not been justified The use of additional MSS enables me to correct a good many slips and one or two serious omissions in Rajendralala s text but it establishes the fact that the tradition as to the text seems unbroken Variant readings occur here and there but none of sufficient importance to justify the idea that any different recensions of the text ever existed and it is hardly ever possible to feel serious doubt as to the correct reading What is especially important is that MSS from both the extreme north—as Buhler s MS from Kashmir—and the south agree in presenting the same text Further the commentary of Sayana presents the same text as the commentaries of Sankara on Books II and III, and of Ānandatirtha and *Viśveśvara on the same books*

### The MS Material

The MSS which directly or indirectly have been used for this edition are as follows —

1 A This MS is dated *samvat* 1854 (= A D 1797) and contains the text of the Āranyaka complete It belonged to Colebrooke, who

[1] *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society* 1877 Extra No p 34

annotated it, and used it when writing his *Essays* The substance of his note on the authorship, *Essays*, I, 46, occurs on fol 60ᵛ of the MS The MS is No 76 in Eggeling's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS in the Library of the India Office*, Part I Written on paper in Devanagari

**2. B** This MS is on birch-bark and in Sārada characters It contains the Rgveda Samhita the Khilakanda, and on ff 188ʳ–191, the Aitareya Āranyaka, Book III, only It was discovered by Prof Buhler, and the information it offers regarding the Khilas is discussed by Prof Macdonell, *Brhaddevatā*, I, xxxi See also Max Muller, *S B E*, I, lxxviii, lxxix, who used it in preparing his translation of the Upanisad, and Dr Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp 32 sq, 167, 168 It probably dates about A D 1575[1]

The variants of this MS have been referred to as important, both by Buhler and Dr Scheftelowitz. This view appears to me erroneous Whatever may be the value of the MS for the criticism of the text of the Rgveda[2] it contributes, in my opinion not a single correction to the text of Āranyaka III It contains many errors e.g *prajaya*, *prajayah* for *prajayā*, *samhitiya* for *samhitya*, *sandhiny* for *sandhin*, *abhyasam* for *abhyāsam*, &c Most of its variants can be proved incorrect from the context In III, 1, 4, *cen* is omitted in the first clause, but in the second *cen* occurs and it is most improbable that the word should be omitted in the first of two precisely parallel clauses. Then also *chaknuvantam* is read without the negative, which reduces the passage to nonsense In III, 1 5, *purva* is omitted before *rupam* but the context urgently requires its presence, the words *putra aha* are also omitted, but leave *madhyamah* unintelligible, and *ekikurvan* for *anekikurvan* is contradicted by the next clause In III, 1, 6, a whole clause is omitted because it begins and ends with the same words as the preceding clause, *tam* is omitted in a Rgvedic quotation while by diplography *sa saisaditih* stands for *saisaditih* In III, 2, 1, an unnecessary *iti* is inserted before *etat proktam*, presumably because an *iti* is expected with the form *proktam*, and the whole phrase *trayam tv eva na ity etat proktam* is repeated in III, 2, 2, where it is not in place In III, 2, 1, it is required because it contradicts a view of Hrasva Mandukeya that there was a fourth class In III, 2, 2, the threefold division is accepted The same tendency to

[1] See my note, *J R A S*, 1907, p 275

[2] Cf Oldenberg *Gott gel Anz*, 1907, pp 235 sq

diplography is seen in the double *akar* in the same section In III, 2, 3, the obvious *brahmanam* appears for *brahmānam*, but just before we have *brahmā rasah* In the list in III, 2, 2, *manomayah* is wanting, but it appears in the precisely similar list in III, 2, 3 Another omission is seen in *nasyanukte*, III, 2, 4, for *na tasyanūkte*, and *'mato* has fallen out between *'gato* and *'nato* The defective *āskandati* is balanced by *jīvaūsyati*

Other alterations are inferior in sense In III, 2, 4 *vāśarīram* for *vāsirasam* after *jihmaśirasam* postulates the possibility of perceiving a disembodied spirit, which is difficult, *candrama evādityo*, ibid, is inferior to *ivādityo*, *apagirati* is required rather than *avagirati*, &c

The only passage in which B offers at first sight a better text is III, 2, 6 *Prajapatih prajah srstva vyasramsad a samvatsaram*, where it may be suggested to take *a samvatsaram* as = over a year This is not quite impossible but it is not likely, and then the proper form is undoubtedly the middle, cf *visramsata*, Aitareya Brahmana, III, 27, &c Further, it is very difficult to see how the standard text could ever have been altered from this reading But palaeographically the corruption found here is quite easy *d* and *t* are not very different in Saradā MSS, and *t* actually appears for *dh* in III, 2 3 *anuvitan* for *anuvidham*, a much less easy mistake Then *a* and *ā* are often interchanged, as in *anuvitau* just cited, and in *anjani*, III, 2, 3, for *anjani*, *anusamhitam*, III, 2 6, for *anusamhitam* *samvatsaram* may have followed when *a* became *a*, or have been an independent attempt at an easier reading

Other errors are the interchange of *a* and *i*, *°samhitah*, III, 1, 1, for *°samhatah*, *batirakam*, III, 2, 4, for *batarakam*, of *a* and *e* the characteristic stroke for the latter being omitted *agnar* and *ratrisuktana*, III, 2 4 *r* is treated like *ri* and so written in *rite*, III, 2, 2, so in the Khilas, V, 3 *vayrtu rājase* is written for *vayrtun*, cf Scheftelowitz, p 175 *i* and *ī* are also confused

In some points the MS is accurate Before gutturals and labials the appropriate sign for *h* is used For *h s* or *h s*, *sl* or *ss* always occur, and anusvara is practically never misused After *r* and *m* duplication of consonants is regular, and for *d ha* is always written *d dha*

But on the whole, I consider the MS, though in many ways valuable, yet to contain many corruptions due in part to the errors inevitable in transcription and copying of Saradā MSS and in part to attempted correction of the text The result of the comparison with the text of the

Āranyaka and with the Śankhāyana Āranyaka leads me to look with doubt on the readings of the MS where they differ from other sources

3 C This MS was written in *śake* 1585 (= A D 1663), *śobha asadhat adi 7 bhrgau* by Saradanandavamsodbhava Mahadeva The first sixteen leaves, however, are in a different hand and originally formed part of another MS They contain part of Book II, while the rest of the MS contains part of Book III (ff 17–103) and the last Khanda of the third Adhyaya of Book V, in each case with Sayana's commentary See Eggeling No 83 Written on paper in Devanagari

4 D This MS is one of the Whish collection in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society It is on palm leaves and in Grantha characters, legible and not very incorrect. See Thomas in Winternitz *Catalogue of South Indian Sanskrit Manuscripts*, No 191 It contains the Āranyaka complete Its probable date is A D 1700

5 E This MS was presented by Dr Burnell to the India Office It is fairly well written in Grantha characters on palm leaves It is No 84 of Dr Burnell s collection, see *Catalogue of a Collection of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Part I *Vedic Manuscripts* It contains the Āranyaka complete It probably dates from the eighteenth century

6 F This MS belonged to Colonel Claud Martin and like G appears to have been presented to the India Office by Colebrooke It forms part of a corpus consisting of the Āśvalayana Srauta Sutra Purvasatka (ff 1–20) Uttarasatka (ff 1–11) Grhya Sūtra (ff 1–17) Sarvanukramani (ff 17ᵛ–24) and Āranyaka (ff 25 35) It contains the Āranyaka complete See Eggeling No 80 Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century

7. G Like F this MS belonged to Col Claud Martin, and was presented to the India Office by Colebrooke It also contains a corpus consisting of Āśvalayana Srauta Sutra, Purvasatka (ff 1–64), Uttarasatka (ff 1–40), Grhya Sutra (ff 1–26) Sarvanukramani (ff 1–28) and Āranyaka (ff 1–45), complete See Eggeling No 79 Written on paper in Devanagari about the end of the eighteenth century This MS is closely connected with F

8 H This MS contains the commentary of Visveśvaratirtha on a commentary by Anandatirtha on Books II and III of the Āranyaka. The text is not cited in full but the commentary shows that it was identical with the text of Sayana See Eggeling No 84 Written on paper in Devanagari in the seventeenth century

See Eggeling No 87 Written on paper in Devanāgari in *saṁvat* 1853 (= A D 1796)

**18 25** $R^{1-8}$ are the MSS used by Rajendralala Mitra for his edition, *Aitareya Aranyaka with the Commentary of Sayana Acarya Bibl Ind*, Nos 325 329 335 337, and 345 Calcutta, 1875-1876 Their description is (Introd, pp 20, 21) as follows —

*Ka* (= $R^1$), lent by Pandit Vamana, of the Benares Sanskrit College dated *saṁvat* 1816 (= A D 1759) *virodhisaṁvatsare kārttikaśukla-saptamyaṁ Viśveśvararājadhanyam* It contained the commentary of Sayana on the whole Aranyaka

*Kha* (= $R^2$), from the Sanskrit College at Calcutta, containing Sayana's commentary on Books I and II Apparently old

*Ga* (= $R^3$) from Dr G Buhler of Bombay, dated *śrāvaṇavadi* 30 *śaṁvare śake* 1788 (= A D 1866) *kṣayanāmasaṁvatsare*, containing the commentary complete

*Gha* (= $R^4$) copied for Rajendralala under the superintendence of Babu Amrtalala of Benares and collated with two different codices the codex copied being dated *saṁvat* 1828 (= A D 1771) *śrāvaṇavadi* 3 It contained the commentary complete

*Ka* (= $R^5$) copied for Rajendralala under Amrtalala s superintendence and collated with a MS dated *saṁvat* 1775 (= A D 1718) *kīlakanāma saṁvatsare dakṣiṇāyane varṣa rtau bhādrapade māsi kṛṣṇapakṣe bhṛguvāsare taddine pustakaṁ samāptam* It contained the text complete

*Kha* (= $R^6$) copied for Dr Burnell of Mangalore and lent to Rajendralala. The original belonged to a pandit in Tanjore It contained the text complete Cf E

*Ga* (= $R^7$) from the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal containing Book II only of the text, written in the saka year named Vyaya by Narayana of Candrapura for his master Śivarama

*Gha* (= $R^8$) from the Library of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, containing Book IV, with Sayana s commentary

Of these *ka* and *kha* (presumably $R^5$ and $R^6$) are said to belong to the same class But it is clear that Rajendralala merely compiled an eclectic text from the various MSS and that he did not contemplate a critical text R *denotes the reading of the edition when it appears to rest on all the MSS available*

**26-34** $S^{1-9}$ are the MSS used in the edition in the Anandasrama

series, 1898, No 38, with Sāyana's commentary by Bābāśāstri Phadake They are as follows —

*Ka* (= S[1]), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Srimat Gurumahārāja, of Karavirapura

*Kha* (= S[2]), containing text and commentary complete, belonging to Gangādhara Sāstri Dātāra, of Punyapattana

*Ga* (= S[3]) and *Gha* (= S[4]), containing text and commentary complete, from the Anandāsrama library

*Na* (= S[5]), containing text and commentary of Books II-IV, belonging to Bhāusāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrapura

*Ca* (= S[6]) and *Cha* (= S[7]), containing text only, from the Ānandā srama library

*Ja* (= S[8]), containing text only, belonging to Bhāusāheba Bālāsāheba Kibe, of Indūrapura

*Jha* (= S[9]), containing text only, belonging to Śankararāva Bhāgavata, of Thāne.

There is no doubt that some care has been taken in giving the variant readings which are practically confined to the commentary Where the MSS appear to agree, S is used to denote the reading of the edition The text of the Āranyaka in this edition contains some errors and omissions, but is superior to that of Rājendralāla

**35. T.** This is the version found in the collection of 108 Upanisads published in Telugu character at Madras in 1883 It contains no important variants, and seems conclusively to prove that the South had no separate recension. See Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda*, p 534 In view of Sankara's influence in Southern India, this was only to be expected

**36. U.** This symbol is used to denote the text of the Upanisad with Sankara's commentary, Ānandatirtha s super-commentary, and with Vidyāranya's (Sāyana's) Dipikā, published in the Ānandāsrama series, 1889, No 11. For this edition were used five MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha, na*) of the text, commentary, and super-commentary, six MSS (*ca, cha, ja, jha, tha, da*) of the commentary, two MSS (*ka, kha*) of the text alone, and four MSS (*ka, kha, ga, gha*) of the Dipikā, besides two editions (*ña, ta*) The variants are, however, almost confined to the commentary.

**37. W.** This MS contains Sāyana's commentary on Book I of the Āranyaka It is on palm-leaves and in Malayālam characters, and is very

inaccurate It is one of the Whish MSS in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society See Winternitz, No 1 (b), who assigns it to the eighteenth or nineteenth century

38 X This MS contains Sankara's commentary on Books II and III of the Āranyaka It is written on palm leaves in Malayālam characters The MS is much damaged It is No 158 in Winternitz s *Catalogue*, and may be assigned to the seventeenth century

Of these MSS I have collated all save $R^{1-3}$, $S^{1-9}$, and those used in U There are many other MSS and editions of the Upanisad in existence and several MSS of the Āranyaka (see Aufrecht *Catalogus Catalogorum*, s vv) but there is no reason to suppose that any of them would add anything new to the text Max Muller used (cf *S B E*, I, xcvii) a MS of the text with Sankara and Ānandatirtha's commentaries, and also a commentary by Sankara[1] on Book III, Adhyaya 1, but he states that the MSS he used gave little aid It appears from Weber s Catalogue that the Berlin MSS have no independent value

The MSS used are on the whole decidedly inferior They are modern copies and contain many clerical errors No useful purpose would be served by recording all the blunders of the scribes I have therefore printed only those which seemed of more importance, either textually or palaeographically, save in the case of B, in view of the special—if somewhat artificial—interest of that MS

In Rājendralala s edition, and in Max Muller's translation of the first three books of the Āranyaka (*S B E* I) the text besides the division into Adhyayas and Khandas shown in all the MSS, is divided into short sections which are numbered These numbers seem to be attributable to Rajendralala himself, as there is no trace of them in any of the MSS I have used or in the Ānandaśrama edition The divisions follow the treatment by Sayana of the text in his commentary, but they cannot be said to be always satisfactory, consistent or convenient, and I have not felt bound to adopt them None of the MSS show any satisfactory or consistent punctuation—such a punctuation being practically unknown in Sanskrit MSS of prose works—and I have therefore adopted what seemed to me the most convenient punctuation

[1] That this is the correct description of the work follows from a comparison with X though the MS does not name the author (Wickremasinghe *J R A S*, 1902 p 632)

In the Upanisad (II 4-6) within the Khandas there is a division into sections in accordance with Sankara's commentary which differs greatly from that of Sayana, and which has been adopted in the editions of the Upanisad This enumeration might have been retained for convenience of reference, but for the sake of consistency I have preferred to omit it

With regard to the text of Sāyana's commentary it may be observed that neither Rājendralala nor the Ānandaśrama edition gives a very correct version It is clear that Rajendralala freely corrected his MSS, and that even the numerous variants given in the Ānandaśrama do not exhaust the variations of reading Curiously enough the editors of the latter cannot have consulted the former For example the commentary on *madhumati* in V, 2 2, reads *saraso* (*casau* is suggested as a correction) *madhvadimadhuryarasopetatvan madhuman* Rajendralāla has *sa ca somayyādimadhuryarasopetatvan madhuman* which, as the noun is (*upa*) *prakse* glossed as *yagapradeśe*, is neat and convincing Or again V, 2, 1, where Rajendralala has the obvious *savah vairinam balam*, while the Ānandaśrama has [*vairi*] *nam* [*śavo?*] *balam* while just after *im ativyathir* is rendered according to Rajendralala *enam śatrum atisayena calitavan*, and according to the Ānandāsrama *imam sattum* &c One MS, S[3], has *santum*, and of course there is no easier mistake in MSS than that of *tr*, *tt*, and *nt*, while interchange of sibilants is constant Or again in the quotations at the end of V, 1 5, both editions present bad texts but Rājendralāla has *etac carma* while the Anandaśrama has *etac ca karma*, which in view of the context is absurd Many other instances could be quoted, and undoubtedly either in many places Rajendralala's MSS were superior or his critical judgement was better, probably the former Further, there are repeated,—sometimes very serious, e g I 5, 2,—omissions in the Ānandaśrama text, and in places, e g I, 5, 1, the text has been badly confused

On the other hand, there are many instances where the Ānandaśrama text is superior to that of Rajendralāla For example the note in the latter edition on II, 3, 4, p 226, line 3 from foot *dhyanayapyam*[1] *anenaikapaksah* is meaningless, but a perfectly good sense is given by the Ānandaśrama reading (see note on p 135) *Dhanamjayyam*

[1] Cf the absurd reading in the ed of Latyayana Srauta Sutra III, 1?, 11, *Dhānamjapyah*

The comparison of the two editions would give a satisfactory text in all respects save in quotations from unknown works In these Rajendralāla is usually superior to the Ānandaśrama but neither is very accurate, and further MS authority would be requisite

From a comparison of the recorded readings the MSS of the commentary appear to be divisible into the following classes (1) $R^1$, and $R^3$, with which may be classed C, and so far as it goes I, (2) $S^1$, $S^2$, $S^4$, $S^5$, which approach closely to class (1)—in this class $S^1$ and $S^2$, and $S^4$ and $S^5$ are closely related, *(3)* $S^3$ *which falls into a distinct class of* its own, (4) $R^2$ and $R^4$ which again form a distinct class, and (5) W

The MS material available would not suffice to form a text either of Śankara's commentary on the Āranyakas II and III, or of Visveśvara's super commentary on Ānandatirtha s commentary on those Āranyakas the more so in the latter case that no MSS of the commentary itself have yet come to light

In the edition of Rajendralala and in the MSS A and E only are accents used These accents are clearly confined to those verses not occurring in the Rgveda Samhita which are quoted in full in the Āranyaka V Unfortunately in the edition the accents are often obviously *incorrect, one word having two accents, or a series of words being incor*rectly accented so as to show that an error in printing must have taken place The MSS also, as often are *carelessly* and *inaccurately accented*, and it is therefore not possible to lay stress on the accentuation of any rare words, especially compounds The matter is of little consequence, however, as the total number of accented words is small and nearly all, save a few compound words are recorded in well accented texts

It may here be mentioned that I have, wherever necessary, restored correct spellings, e g *pattram* not *patram*, and have in accordance with the normal practice of the MSS,[1] omitted visarga before a sibilant followed by a hard consonant In the case of *ch* I have never inserted the *c*[2] but in deference to the ordinary practice I have always written *tad dhi*, not *tad hi*, and of course *uddhrtya* for *ud hrtya* On the other

[1] Cf Macdonell *Brhaddevata* I xxvi, n 4 Allowed by Vārttika on Panini, VIII 3, 36

[2] Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 227 In Lanman s edition of Whitney s translation of the Atharvaveda *ch* is written everywhere even when *cch* represents an assimilated letter + *ch*, e g *brhachanti*, in which case *cch* is used in this edition Cf, however, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 154 sq, Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p 31

hand, duplication after *r* has been omitted, though it is usual in all the MSS, while the avagraha is inserted wherever it is properly required despite its omission in the MSS The nasal in Pluti is represented by the ardhacandra mark In R the ordinary anusvāra is used as is done in the MSS, but not in S

**II The Commentaries**

The commentaries on the Āranyaka which I have used are the following —

**1 Sankara's** commentary on the Upanisad (II, 4-6) Sankara's date has now through the evidence of the Āryavidyāsudhakara and Pathak's researches (*Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVIII, 88, 218 sq), been definitely fixed from A D 788 to the middle of the ninth century The date A D 820 formerly assigned to his death, must refer to the commencement of his labours This commentary has been repeatedly printed, best in the Anandāśrama series Poona, 1889

**2 Śankara's** commentary on Book II, the first part of the Mahaita reyopanisad This is only available in the MSS P and X, neither of which presents an accurate text In the Adhyayas 4-6, it is of course identical with (1) Fortunately the analogy of Sayana's commentary on Adhyāyas 4-6 and comparison of the two commentaries on Adhyāyas 1-3 establish the fact that Sayana followed Śankara with considerable fidelity

**3 Śankara's** commentary on Book III, the Samhitopanisad This is only available in the MS X but is followed by Sayana

**4 Ānandatīrtha's** super commentary on Śankara's commentary on the Upanisad Anandatīrtha is said to have died in A D 1198 and to have been a pontiff of the Madhva sect (Bhandarkar, *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, 1882 1883 pp 18 103) The date has recently been questioned by Harikrsna Śastrin (*Epigr Ind*, VI, 261) who prefers to date him from A D 1238-1317, on epigraphic evidence of considerable weight This commentary has frequently been printed, best in the Anandaśrama series As has been mentioned above in several MSS the commentary is attributed to Abhinavanārayanendra, who in one of the MSS in the Bodleian Library (*Catalogue*, No 977) is thus described *iti śrimatkai alyendrasarasvatipūjyapadaśisyaśrīmatjñanendrasarasvatīpujyapadaśisyaśrimadabhinavanarayanendrasarasvatīviracitayam Aitareyabhasyatikayam* I There can be little doubt but that we

must assume Ānandatīrtha's real name to have been Abhinavanārayanendra Sarasvati, especially as he is indifferently called Ānandatirtha, Anandagiri, or Anandajñāna, the name he probably took as pontiff[1] Cf also No 1010 (3) in the *Catalogue*, where he is called Narayanendra Sarasvatī

5 **Viśveśvaratīrtha's** super commentary on Ānandatirtha's commentary on Books II and III This is only available in the MSS H and O, and no MSS of the commentary itself appear to be extant Ānandatirtha, who is called *bhagavatpadacarya*, must, I think, be identical with the Ānandatirtha above mentioned, and must have written two different works in connexion with the Aranyaka, first the super-commentary on Śankara s commentary, and second an independent commentary on the Āranyaka, in which he interprets it in a Vaisnava sense Max Müller (*S B E*, I, xcviii) appears to doubt this identity, but it must be remembered that Ānandatirtha was a Madhva and so not unlikely to be disposed to adopt a Vaisnava interpretation and that there is nothing rare in Indian literary history in finding an author ready to comment on both sides of a question Compare the case of Vacaspatimiśra,[2] who wrote commentaries on the works of all the philosophical schools save one Further the interpretation of Sankara had always to contend against that of Ramanuja,[3] and it was by no means unnatural for a scholar like Ānandatirtha to set forth both views, the Vaisnava interpretation representing his own

Viśveśvaratirtha appears to have been the pupil of Anandatirtha, and to have written this work in the lifetime of his master, as is indicated by verse 3 of the introduction *Aitareyopanisado vyakurmo bhasyam uttamam | śrimadanamdatirtharyan natva tatpritikamuklah* ‖ 3 ‖ It is worth noting that Jayatirtha, the successor of Ānandatirtha similarly wrote a super commentary on Anandatirtha s commentary on the Praśna Upanisad, and that that commentary is distinct from Ānandatīrtha's super commentary on the commentary of Śankara on that Upanisad[4] The same remark[5] applies to Ānandatirtha s commentary on the Īśavasya Upanisad and to his super commentary on the commentary of Sankara

[1] So Jayatirtha s original name was Raghunātha, Bhandarkar l c

[2] See Cowell and Gough Translation of *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* Preface p vi n 1

[3] See Thibaut *S B E*, XLVIII, *J R A S*, 1906 pp 490 sq

[4] See the Bodleian *Catalogue*, No 1013 (2)

[5] Ibid No 1013 (3)

on that Upanisad Visvesvara was evidently closely connected with Anandatirtha, as a MS of Anandatirtha's super commentary on Sankara s commentary on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad of the seventeenth century is described by a later hand as *Visveśvaranandatirthamathastham* (Bendall, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*, p 15) Bendall l c, refers to a commentary by Viśveśvaratirtha on the super commentary of Anandatirtha on the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, but the evidence cited above leaves little doubt but that the commentary of Viśvesvaratirtha is on an independent commentary by Ānandatirtha and not on his super commentary The exact locality of this Math is unknown but Jayatirtha it may be noted, was a native of Mangalavedhem near Pandharpur

**6. Sāyana's** commentary on the whole Āranyaka Besides the edition of Rajendralala Mitra and that in the Ānandaśrama series I have used MSS C, I and W There are many minor variants in the text but there is no trace of any double recension In the Ānandaśrama edition of the Upanisad the commentary is attributed to *srimatpara mahamsaparivrajakacarya vidyaranyamuni* This as Klemm has shown in the *Gurupujakaumudi*, is the title of Madhava the brother of Sayana, and not of Sayana This attribution to Madhava is an error, Sayana in the preface tells us distinctly that the work is his *tatkataksena tadrupam dadhad Bukkamahipatih | adiśat Sayanacaryam ved irthasya prakasane* || 3 || In all probability it was genuinely composed by Sayana himself, it agrees with his Rgveda commentary in general and was written after the commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana It was written probably under Bukka I, who was certainly reigning in A D 1354 That Sayana died in A D 1387 is probably an error, though that may be the year of Madhava s death His commentary throughout is dependent on that of Sankara on Books II and III, as he admits in the introduction to Book II

Sankara, Ānandatirtha in his super commentary, and Sayana all interpret the Upanisads in II and III in the light of the Vedanta On the other hand Viśvesvara in the super commentary follows Ānandatirtha in giving a Vaisnava interpretation I have not followed either view The Upanisads can only be satisfactorily explained by regarding them as what they are, early attempts at philosophy, and by refraining from reading later ideas into them The interpretations given by the com-

mentators have, however, a value as showing the development of philosophical ideas, and I have therefore whenever desirable referred to them. In several cases too they afford great assistance in the interpretation of the text.

It may here be mentioned[1] that most of Book II, that is, Adhyāyas 1–3, 4, and Adhyayas 4–6, are translated by the author of the Persian translation which was made for Dara Shukoh between A D 1656–1657, and retranslated into Latin in 1801, 1802, by Anquetil Duperron. This translation, besides being much less intelligible than the original, adds, as far as I can see, nothing substantial to our knowledge.

The commentary of Śaṅkara establishes for the ninth century the text of the second and third books of the Aranyaka as we now have them. Whether there were variants in his time we cannot determine with certainty, as his text has clearly alone formed the subject of study. The other commentators all depend to some degree on him. Ānandatirtha, in his own work, uses him, and Sayana uses both him and Ānandatirtha. The evidence for the time before Sankara is wanting. The later Upanisads borrowed their doctrines and phrases from works which were more developed and displayed more literary pretensions than the Aitareya, while the secular literature makes no direct quotations. All we can say is that the Mokṣadharma of the Mahabharata and Badarayana in his Brahma Sutra (III, 3, 16, 17) probably used the Aitareya Upanisad,[2] but the next evidence is again Śankara's commentary on those Sutras.

Though strict proof beyond Sankara cannot be attempted, there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the text of these books. They are not, in subject-matter, open to easy interpolation, and in all probability in their present form they fairly represent their original shape in the time of Saunaka.

Nor is there any special reason to assume alteration in the verses which make up Book IV for which there is considerable independent evidence.

For Books I and V we have no earlier authority than Sayana. But he appears to have had before him a fixed text, and the various readings which he gives are practically limited to the last chapter of V, 3, the contents of which certainly lay it open to interpolation yet Sayana of

[1] Cf Max Muller, *S B E*, I, lvii sq, Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, pp 535 sq

[2] Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishad's*, p 78 English Translation, p 29, and, for the Mokṣadharma, note on II 5

course was not the first to write a commentary on the Āranyaka He expressly refers, on V, 1, 1, to differences of interpretation, as to whether *tivrasyabhivayasah* (RV, X, 160, 1) meant four verses or one only according to rule, and on V, 3 3, he refers to differences both of reading and of opinion We are therefore justified in regarding the text he gives as practically a textus receptus by the fourteenth century A D

Whether or not it is original cannot be answered with certainty Amongst others, Hillebrandt (*Sankhayana Śrauta Sutra*, pp x–xv) considers that the text of the Sūtras is much altered from the original, but in the case of the Āranyaka I, or V, it would be difficult to prove this doctrine, inasmuch as the Āranyaka seldom presents the truly remarkable variety of rules and exceptions shown by the present text of Sankhāyana Further the text of the first book assists in checking the fifth book, and appears throughout to agree with it Again in the former case, where the work is a true Āranyaka, the idea of later alteration is less probable than in a formless work like the fifth book, which is practically a Sutra itself Moreover, although a certain fluidity of text may be admitted in the Sutras, the extent of such fluidity appears to be greatly exaggerated by Hillebrandt

### III The divisions of the Āranyaka and their date

There is some uncertainty as to the exact meaning of the word Āranyaka Sāyana gives two somewhat different interpretations of it In the preface to the Aitareya Brāhmana (Aufrecht's edition, p iii) he describes it as *Aranyavratarupam brahmanam* in the preface to the Āranyaka itself he says *Aitareyabrahmane 'sti kandam Aranyaka bhidham | aranya eva pathyatvad aranyakam itiryate* ‖ 5 ‖ and *sattra prakarane uktir aranyadhyayanaya hi | mahavratasya tasyatra hautram karma vivicyate* ‖ 8 ‖ The latter view is energetically supported by Oldenberg[1] and is adopted by Macdonell[2] The former has the support of Weber[3] and Deussen[4] argues in favour of it on the ground that the aim of the Āranyakas was to supply a substitute for the sacrificial rites to be used by Vānaprasthas This view, however, is rather far fetched The Āranyaka seems originally to have existed to give secret explanations of the ritual, and to have presupposed that the ritual was still in use and was known No doubt the tendency was for the secret explana-

[1] *Prolegomena*, p 291
[2] *Sanskrit Literature*, p 34
[3] *Indian Literature*, p 48
[4] *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p 3

tion to grow independent of the ritual until the stage is reached where the Aranyaka passes into the Upanisad, and contemporaneously the life of the Hindu is differentiated into the four Aśramas But originally an Aranyaka must have merely meant a book of instruction to be given in the forest

It is not now possible to decide exactly why the Aitareya Brahmana does not deal with the Mahāvrata rite In Sayana s time it was already held that the author of the Aitareya Brahmana was also the author of the Aitareya Āranyaka, Books I III,[1] and Sankara may conceivably have held the same view, as he calls the Upanisad the Bahvrcabrahmana Upanisad[2] It is however, impossible to accept this version as correct It is probable enough that Mahidasa Aitareya is the editor or arranger of the Aitareya Brahmana, as Aufrecht thought, It is true that the Aitareya Brahmana is not in all probability the work of one hand or period,[3] but it must have been at some early date welded into one work, and tradition may fairly be considered to have given us the name of the man who did it We know from Panini V 1, 62, that in his day Brahmanas of thirty and forty Adhyāyas existed and Weber's[4] conjecture that the reference is to the Sankhayana and Aitareya Brahmanas is almost certainly correct But though we can fairly ascribe to Mahidasa the arrangement of the Brahmana it would be incorrect to ascribe to him even the first three books of the Aranyaka since in them he is cited as a teacher He is named expressly in II, 1, 8 and 3 7, and is clearly referred to in I 1, 1 This must be taken as decisive[5] against his authorship of these books of the Aitareya Aranyaka though it is clear that some of his views are expressed in them We may perhaps suppose that Mahidasa besides editing the Brahmana was a philosopher of some distinction since otherwise his name would hardly have come down to us. Of his life we know nothing Sayana tells us a legend of his being the son of

[1] See Aufrecht s ed t on of the Brahmana p 11 Max Muller *S B E* I c v

[2] Max Muller I c p xc 1

[3] See Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p 203

[4] *Ind an Literature* p 45

[5] So Rajendralala Introduct on p 8 Weber, *Ind an Literature* p. 48 and cf Macdonell *Brhaddevat* I xx 1 for a sim lar case See also however Weber *Ind Stud*, XIII 322 sq accord ng to whom Patanjal appears to allude to h m self in the th rd person This however is less l kely to be the case at so early a date as that of Mah dasa though later it is not rare

Itarā; Ānandatīrtha, in his original commentary, describes him as the son of Viśāla and an incarnation of Nārāyana. Perhaps there is some truth in the reference to him in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, III, 16, 7, and the Jaiminīya Upanisad Brāhmaṇa, IV, 2, where he is said to have lived for 116 years, at any rate it shows that he was a famous sage and probably a real person.[1]

The three books attributed to him can on internal evidence be divided into four parts. The **first book** consists of an explanation of the Mahāvrata from a ritualistic and allegorical point of view. It describes the different Śastras of the morning, midday and evening libations of the Mahāvrata day of the Gavāmayana, a theme touched on in the Aitareya Brāhmana, III, 1–38, IV, 14, but indulges in further allegorical play of ideas On the whole it bears a close resemblance in contents and style to the Brāhmana, but it is doubtless more recent in date, or it would have been included in the Brāhmana. Sāyana in his introduction to Book V calls it an *apauruṣeyaṃ brāhmaṇam*, and Śankara calls the Upaniṣad similarly Bahvrcabrāhmana Upaniṣad.

The **second book** consists of two distinct parts. The first, comprising Adhyāyas 1–3, deals with the allegorical signification of the Uktha, that is the Niṣkevalya Śastra, three sets of eighty verses, which was the midday Śastra of the Mahāvrata, as being Prāṇa or Puruṣa. It is not directly connected with Book I, and it is doubtless later than it. The second part comprises Adhyāyas 4–6, and is the Upaniṣad *par excellence*. It is probably later than part one.

The **third book** treats of the mystic meaning of the various forms of the text of the Saṃhitā, the *nirbhuja*, *pratrṇṇa* and *ubhayamantareṇa*, and of the vowels, semivowels and consonants. It quotes Māndūkeya and Śākalya among others, and makes use of the above terms to describe the *saṃhitā*, *pada*, and *krama pāthas* of the Samhitā. These are so far signs of late origin, but at the same time the treatment of the subject-matter is at a much earlier stage than that reached by Yāska or the authors of the Prātiśākhyas. It will be seen later that its philosophical view is more advanced than that of the Upaniṣad proper, and it can probably be dated about the sixth cent. B C. This result is important,

[1] The references to Aitareya and Mahaitareya in Śānkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, and Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 4, throw no light on him, and are probably late; cf. Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, p 390.

as it gives us a lower date for the rest of the earlier books of the Upanisad

The **fourth book** consists solely of the Mahanamnī verses The presence of these verses is explained by Sayana on the ground that they must be studied in the forest Their use is set forth by Āśvalayana in his Srauta Sutra, VII 12 10, where he says that on the fifth day of the six day Prsthya rite after the Marutvatiya Sastra, when the Niskevalya Śastra is being performed 'if the Udgatrs make the Sakvarasaman the Prstha Stotra then the nine verses called the Mahanamnis and certain *purisa padas* to fill up the lines, are to be used' Tradition ascribes this Āranyaka to Āsvalayana Sadgurusisya in his account of the works of Āsvalayana, says[1] *dvadasādhyayakam sutram catuskam grhyam eva ca caturtharanyakam ceti hy Asvalayanasutrakam* । This view, however has been questioned in connexion with the authorship of the fifth book

The **fifth book** consists mainly of a description in a Sutra style of the Niskevalya Sastra the great Sastra of the midday libation of the Mahavrata It forms a sort of complement to Book I, which is the Brahmana as contrasted with the Sutra The natural conclusion is, therefore, that Āśvalayana wrote Book V The arguments[2] in favour of this view are (1) Book IV contains merely a collection of Mahanamni verses, it is not a Sutra at all and therefore Āśvalayana cannot have been its author The reply is perhaps that the verses may have been collected by Āśvalayana and put into the Āranyaka in order that they might be available for being commented on in the Sutra and that it would therefore be natural to ascribe the Aranyaka to Āśvalayana It is a sort of Āśvalayana Samhitā like the Sakala Samhitā (2) It is argued[3] that Sayana in the introduction to Aranyaka V, where he expressly ascribes that Aranyaka as contrasted with I to a Rsi uses the words *tasmad athaitasya[4] samamnayasyaitadadid adaśadhyayatan maha vratasya pañcavimśatim ityadi pañcamaranyakam sutram eva* । This would no doubt be quite natural if Āśvalayana were the author of the Aranyaka but it is at least equally natural if Śaunaka was (3) Cole brooke (*Essays*, I, 307) says, with reference to a Sutra of the Purva

[1] Max Muller *Ancient Sanskrit Literature* p 238, Macdonell, *Sarvānukramani* p x x

[2] See especially Oldenberg *S B E*, XXIX, 154 sq On p. 155 the words 'fifth and fourth should be transposed

[3] Cf Rājendralala Introduction p. 10.

[4] i e Śrauta Sutra I, 1 1

Mimimsā 'It is, however acknowledged that a mistake may be made, and the work of a human author may be erroneously received as a part of the sacred book by those who are unacquainted with its true origin An instance occurs among those who use the *Bahvrich* a *sākha* of the *Rigveda*, by whom a ritual of Āśvalayana has been admitted, under the title of a fifth *Āranjaka*, as a part of the *Rigveda*' Rajendralala was unable to discover the source of this statement, and it seems probably to be a confusion of Āśvalayana with Saunaka, or it may rather confirm the view of Sadguruśisya since IV could be confused with the Rgveda but not V (4) The MSS I and G end *iti Āśvalajanoktam Aranjakam samaptam* | This however, is a matter of no moment, and probably does not even preserve a tradition of Aśvalayana s authorship of Aranyaka IV These two MSS, which are recent and inaccurate copies, and are probably ultimately derived from one original, contain collections of works attributed to Aśvalāyana and there is nothing surprising in the fact that they attribute the authorship of the Aranyaka to him (5) Much more important is the fact which forms Oldenberg s second argument, that in his commentary on the Samaveda Sayana refers (I, p 19) the authorship to Āśvalayana But against this solitary reference[1] must be set the facts noted below (6) There is undoubtedly great similarity between the two works Aranyaka V, and the Srauta Sutra I think it certain that the author of the Aranyaka knew the Sutra For example, in V 2 2 *eṣa brahmeti tisrah* stands without explanation, but as Sayana points out the verses referred to are given in Aśvalayana Srauta Sutra, VI 2 6 Again in V, 3 2, occurs *uktam vasatkaranuman tranam*, which is not only a phrase used by Aśvalayana himself but is a clear reference to Aśvalāyana Srauta Sutra I 5 17[2] Further the vocabulary and syntax of the works is identical e g the use of *na va* in Āranyaka V, 3 1, as often in the Sutra e g VI 5 22, or the phrase *api nidarsanajodaharisjamah*, or the word *ekapatinjah* These facts, however, which were not known to Oldenberg merely prove that

[1] But I do not feel sure as to the reference The words are *bahvrca i adhyāpaka mahāvratayogapratipādaka n Aśvalayananirmitam kalpasutrai ara nye dhiyai ianāh pañcamam aranyakam iti vedati ena i yaval aranti*, and there is clearly some confus on between the Sutra and Āranyaka which discredits the evi dence

[2] Cf also V, 1 5 *uktlav ryām* is not explained but is in the Sutra

Saunaka knew and used Aśvalayana s work which indeed was only natural since the Sutra deals with the Agnistoma the *prakrti* of the Mahavrata It will be seen that this agrees perfectly with the native tradition handed down by Sadguruśisya

There is therefore no sound evidence to ascribe the fifth Aranyaka to Āśvalayana, and Sadguruśisya s attribution to him of the fourth Aranyaka remains the most probable[1] For **Saunaka's authorship of the fifth Aranyaka** we have the distinct and repeated authority of Sayana Colebrooke (*Essays* I 46) first pointed out that Aranyaka V, 2, 5 is cited by Sayana on the Rgveda I, 8, 1, as Saunaka s and Max Muller (*S B E*, I, xcv) says that 'Sayana when quoting in his commentary on the Rig veda from the last books,[2] constantly calls it a Sutra of Saunaka' Further, in his commentary on the Aitareya Aranyaka he repeatedly refers to Saunaka as the author of the fifth book E g on I, 4 1, he says *ata eva pañcame Śaunakenod ihrtah* | and again *taś ca pañcame Śaunakena śakhantaram aśritya pathitah* | See also Sayana[3] on I, 4, 2 (ter), 3 (bis), I, 5, 2 (quater), 3 (bis) These references beyond question show that to Sayana Saunaka was the author of the fifth Aranyaka There is no conceivable reason why this work should have been ascribed to him unless it was his Similar as the book is in language to the Srauta Sutra, yet it is in style less compressed and more intelligible than that work We have certain evidence that Saunaka did compose similar works for, in the introduction to his commentary on the Sarvanukramanī of Katyayana Sadguruśisya expressly records that he composed a Śrauta Sutra which he destroyed when his pupil Aśvalayana had written his Sutra This tradition would explain the close knowledge of Aśvalayana s Śrauta Sutra, which as we have seen above, the writer of this book undoubtedly possessed No doubt it is possible that he may eventually have been credited with the authorship of one of the works of his pupil,

[1] With reference to Oldenberg s remark (p 157) that *Āśv alyanasūtrakam* cannot refer to the Mahanamnis I would observe that the expression refers to the Śrauta and Grhya Sutras with the Āranyaka IV thrown in

[2] Book must be meant Āranyaka IV cannot be quoted

[3] It may be noted that the reference in the Sāmaveda commentary is probably not the work of Sāyana His pupils no doubt did much of his so-called work Cf the case of the Atharvaveda Whitney, p lxvi L The fact that passages in the Sāmaveda commentary are identical with those in the Rgveda commentary is of course quite consistent with this view

as has been shown to be the case by Professor Macdonell in the matter of the Bṛhaddevatā, but that is a mere possibility against which tradition is certainly strong It is impossible to argue that in Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's eyes the term *caturthaṃ anyakam* covered the fifth book also, for the two are quite distinct and cannot ever have been combined into one book Moreover it must be remembered that a Gṛhya Sutra by Saunaka is referred to by Sadguruśiṣya, and appears to have been known to Hemādri in the thirteenth century[1] So there is nothing at all improbable in the ascription of the Aranyaka V to Śaunaka

Now it is possible to throw some light on **Śaunaka's date** The Bṛhaddevatā which is attributed to him, but is certainly not his but the work of a pupil—probably not far removed in date—is posterior to Yaska and anterior to the Sarvanukramani of Kātyāyana Katyayana, who is in all probability the author of the Śrauta Sutra and the Vajasaneyi Anukramani, is most probably anterior to Pānini, since the Sarvānukramani shows forms earlier than Panini's grammar approves (see Macdonell, *Sarvanukramani*, p viii, *Bṛhaddevata*, I, xxii, xxiii) The argument from the use of Vedic forms is no doubt not certain but the balance of probability is in its favour, and it has been maintained by Buhler (*S B E*, II, xl, *Z D M G*, XL, 527 sq) and Winternitz (*Hochzeitsrituell* pp 13 sq) against the objections of Bohtlingk (*Z D M G*, XXXIX, 517, XLI, 669, XLIII, 598 sq)[2] Thus it appears that Saunaka[3] must be considerably older than Panini On the other hand, we must not push him too far back or else it would be difficult to explain how Śaunaka is not cited in Panini Further, B Liebich in his *Panini*, ch iii has shown grounds for the belief that the Aśvalayana and Sankhayana Gṛhya Sutras are in point of language closely connected in time with Panini It does not, therefore, seem necessary to allow more than 100–150 years between Panini and Saunaka, and the time may perhaps be shorter

**Panini's date** unfortunately is not yet certainly fixed. There lie between him and Patañjali not only the Varttikas of Kātyayana, but also

[1] Caland, *Altnenkult*, p 143, Hillebrandt *Ritual Litteratur* p 26

[2] Buhler's results are accepted by Hillebrandt (*Ritual Litteratur*, p 24) Jolly (*Recht und Sitte* p 3) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p 259)

[3] It may also be noted that the anustubhs of Śaunaka are of an early type the first pada sometimes ending in ⏑ – ⏑ ⏓ cf Oldenberg *S B E* XXX xxxv So in the Bṛhaddevata (Keith, *J R A S*, 1906 p 6)

emendations of those Vārttikas by the Bhāradvājīyas, Saunāgas, and others and perhaps a Slokavarttika, which certainly presupposes a considerable interval of time Bhandarkar[1] has further adduced evidence of changes in the language and extension of geographical knowledge especially as regards the peoples and places of the south between Pānini, Kātyāyana, and Patañjali Goldstucker[2] and Bhandarkar[3] have adduced evidence to prove that Patañjali was a contemporary of Pusyamitra (B C 178–142) and Menander (B C 144–120) and wrote his Mahabhāsya in or about B C. 144–142 This result is by no means certain because even accepting as fixed Pusyamitra and Menander's dates,[4] still in the first place the MSS of the Mahabhasya do not all contain the passages in which the statements relied on occur, and in the second place it is always possible that the examples occurred in the Slokavarttika or in some other earlier source whence they were taken over bodily[5] by Patañjali It may even be argued that Patañjali is not earlier than the second century A D inasmuch as he seems to know the *r* vowel sign, and according to Chinese tradition this vowel sign was a discovery of Nagarjuna's, and Nāgarjuna's date is possibly in the second century A D under Kaniska[6] The latter, however, is probably to be referred to the first century B C, and it would be a mistake to lay much stress on this argument The *r* vowel-sign may have existed in grammatical circles long ere Sanskrit inscriptions become usual Further the Rajatarangini, I, 174, is an authority for the existence of the Mahabhāsya in the reign of Abhimanyu of Kashmir, whose date is however now quite uncertain But whatever be Patañjali's date, there seems little doubt that the examples which point to the time of Pusyamitra and Menander must be genuine and that they prove the existence of some commentary on Panini in the middle of the second century B C Katyayana is assigned by Hiuen Tsang to 300 years after the death of Buddha, which taking the Chinese reckoning of the Nirvāna gives the

[1] *Journal Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society*, XVI, 269 sq

[2] *Pānini*, p 228

[3] *Ind Ant*, I, 299, II, 59

[4] Cf Duff, *Chronol of India*, pp 14 17, Hoernle and Stark, *Hist of India* pp 39 sq Vincent Smith (*Hist of India*, pp 192, 193) arrives at a slightly earlier date.

[5] Cf Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 224 V Smith, l. c., ignores the force of this argument Cf Lévi, *Théâtre indien*, p 314

[6] Kaniska's date is most doubtful but see V Smith, *J R A S*, 1903 pp 1 64, Fleet, *J R A S*, 1906, p. 979, 1907, pp 171, 1034 sq, Hoernle, *Osteology*, p 8

middle of the third century B C as his date. This evidence is not of great weight, but it is not improbably nearly correct.[1] Pānini cannot therefore be less than fifty years older than Kātyāyana and must at latest belong to about B.C. 300. The question arises whether this date cannot be put further back. The chief argument against doing so is the use of the word *Yavanānī* in Pāṇini, IV, 1, 49. Doubtless this means Greek (Ionian) writing, but it does not necessarily follow that the word dates from after the invasion of Alexander.[2] Indeed the probability seems to me against this being the case. For it is certainly remarkable that Ionian should be the name given to the Greeks if first made known to India through the invasion of Alexander, whose army was certainly in no conceivable sense Ionian.[3] On the other hand, the Ionian name[4] was evidently the great name in the ears of Persians, and of those subjects who were led into Greece on the expedition of Xerxes, and[5] it must be remembered that the Gandarians were part of Dareios' empire and a contingent from Gandhāra, accompanied Xerxes on the Grecian expedition. If it is borne in mind that Pānini was a native of Gandhāra according to Hiuen Tsang, a view confirmed by the references in his grammar,[6] it will not seem far fetched to consider that it was most probably from the older tradition that the name *Yavanānī* was derived. In this connexion reference may be made to the theory of Burnell[7] that the word *lipi* which occurs in Pānini, III, 2, 21, is borrowed from the Achaemenidean *dipi*, meaning an edict, a view not at all improbable, and one which supports the view here maintained that it was through the Persian conquest of Gandhāra that the word *Yavanani* became familiar to India. Goldstucker[8] argued, indeed, that *Yavanānī* referred to

[1] Cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lx, Pischel, *Prākrit Grammar*, p 34; Liebich, op cit, ch ii, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 312, where he ascribes him to 150 B C, taking the references to Menander and Pusyamitra to be his.

[2] This view is held by Benfey, *Geschichte d Sprachwissenschaft*, p 48, n 1; Burnell, *Aindra Grammarians*, p 44, Weber, l c, p. 221; Wackernagel, l c, p lix.

[3] So in Arrian Ionia appears merely as a province and Ionians as residents therein

[4] We have for this the contemporary evidence of the Athenian Aeschylus and of Herodotus Cf also Busolt, *Griech Ges.*, II, 515

[5] See Herodotus, iii, 91, vii, 66.

[6] Cf Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 218.

[7] *South Indian Palaeography*, p 6. Cf Bartholomae, *Indog. Forsch*, III, 176, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 222

[8] *Pānini*, p 16

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained  But Weber himself admits[1] that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander s time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries  There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander s time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date[2]  Greek engraved gems of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B C 325 at latest[3]

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Panini s date though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century  Weber[4] also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated  Weber s other arguments e g that from the date of Apisali[5] rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination  On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker[6] in referring Panini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *nirvano vate*, VIII, 2 50, because Panini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism[7] or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great  Bhandarkar[8] refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B C dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B C, but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavanani*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature  On the whole I incl ne to fix Panini s date at about 400 350 B C  Bohtlingk, in the introduction to his edition fixed the date at about 350 B C, and Lassen[9] assigned Panini to 330 B C

[1] See *Ind Stud* IV 89  Berlin *Monatsbericht* 1871 p 616 n

[2] Head quoted in Buhler *Palaeographie* p 3

[3] *Vienna Oriental Journal* XIII 307 Fleet *J R A S*, 1907, p 531

[4] *Indian Literature* p 222 n  Goldstucker *Pan ni*, pp 50 sq

[5] *Ind Stud* XIII 375 n  On the other s de Bhandarkar s argument from Samkasa is equally unconvincing cf Weber p 302 n

[6] *Panini* pp 2*5 227

[7] Weber *Ind Stud* V 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddh sm It is not quite conclus ve but is very probable

[8] *Bombay Gazetteer*, I 1 140 sq  The legend cannot be rel ed upon in any particular though accepted by V Sm th *Hist of India* p 337 n. 2

[9] *Ind. Alt.* II, 477, Rapson *J R A S*,

If this date is accepted for Pānini it is necessary to throw the older Kātyāyana, and therefore Śaunaka, a little further back. Śaunaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B.C. or possibly even to 500 B C., which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Āranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period, since the evidence goes to show that Āśvalāyana and he worked contemporaneously.

Now it will hardly be doubted that **Books I–III** are decidedly **older than Books IV, V.** This is clearly reflected in the native tradition preserved in Sāyana's distinction between the *apauruseyam* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brāhmana. It is not possible to say how much this means. But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books, Āranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B.C and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B.C. and 550 B.C. It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book, and the two sections of the second, so that 700 B C. is not too early a date for Book I.

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising. The Brāhmana period, according to Max Muller, probably extended from about 800–600 B.C, and this view has the weighty support of Prof. Macdonell.[1] The Aitareya Brāhmana cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Āranyaka, but the Gopatha Brāhmana, which contains many borrowings from it, is in the opinion of Aufrecht[2] known to Yāska Now Yāska is certainly anterior to Saunaka and Pānini, for he is cited in the Ṛgvedaprātiśākhya,[3] the Brhaddevatā, and is apparently known to the Astādhyāyī. His date cannot, therefore, be reasonably placed later than 500 B C. and it may go back to 550 B C. ?
This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Prātiśākhyas or Pānini. If, therefore, the Gopatha Brāhmana was known to him,[4] even that late work must be dated about

1904, p 442) adopts 350 B C If a late date is adopted, then the question of finding a place for the Bhāsā becomes more and more difficult, cf. *J. R A. S*, 1904, pp 435 sq, 457 sq, and (for the date of the Epic) ibid, 1906, p 2; 1907, p 682.

[1] *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 12, 202 sq

[2] *Aitareya Brahmana*, p vi

[3] Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 41.

[4] The argument is not certain It is based on the fact that Yaska, Nirukta, VIII, 22, quotes Aitareya Brahmana, III,

Persian writing, but this view cannot be maintained But Weber himself admits[1] that perhaps the name Yavana may have become known before Alexander's time through the Persian war in which the Indians served as auxiliaries There is also a striking piece of evidence that Greek writing was known in North India before Alexander's time, coins have been found with Greek inscriptions of pre Alexandrian date[2] Greek engraved gems, of a pattern much earlier than Macedonian times, have been found in the Punjab, and the caduceus was known in India by B C 325 at latest[3]

I do not therefore consider that the evidence of *Yavanani* is conclusive as to Pāṇini s date, though it certainly shows that he cannot be earlier than the fifth century Weber[4] also argues that his use of letters as numerals is a proof of Greek influence, but it may be equally well a proof of Semitic influence or a mere independent invention, as indeed seems most likely from the fact that the use remains isolated Weber's other arguments, e g that from the date of Apiśali,[5] rest on too slight a basis to bear serious examination On the other hand, it is not possible to follow Goldstucker[6] in referring Pāṇini to a date before Buddha on the strength of *nirvano'vāte*, VIII, 2, 50, because Pāṇini probably deliberately ignored Buddhism[7] or perhaps lived when the influence of Buddhism had yet to become great Bhandarkar[8] refers Panini to the beginning of the seventh century B C, dating Katyayana in accordance with the legend of the Kathasaritsagara in the fourth century B C, but he does not meet the difficulty as to *Yavananī*, though his proposed date would in some ways suit the history of Sanskrit literature On the whole I incline to fix Panini s date at about 400–350 B C Böhtlingk, in the introduction to his edition, fixed the date at about 350 B C, and Lassen[9] assigned Panini to 330 B C

[1] See *Ind Stud*, IV, 89, Berlin *Monatsbericht*, 1871, p 616 n

[2] Head quoted in Buhler, *Palaeographie*, p 3

[3] *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 307, Fleet, *J R A S*, 1907, p 531

[4] *Indian Literature*, p 222, n, Goldstucker, *Pāṇini*, pp 50 sq

[5] *Ind Stud*, XIII, 375, n On the other side, Bhandarkar s argument from Samhita is equally unconvincing, cf Weber, p 302 n

[6] *Pāṇini*, pp 225 227

[7] Weber, *Ind Stud*, V, 139 brings evidence that Pāṇini knew Buddhism It is not quite conclusive, but is very probable

[8] *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, ii, 140 sq The legend cannot be relied upon in any particular though accepted by V Smith, *Hist of India*, p 337, n 2

[9] *Ind Alt*, II, 477, Rapson, *J R A S*,

If this date is accepted for Panini it is necessary to throw the older Katyayana and therefore Saunaka a little further back Saunaka may perhaps be assigned to about 450 B C or possibly even to 500 B C, which would then represent the probable date of Book V of the Aranyaka, while the collection of Book IV would be a product of the same period since the evidence goes to show that Aśvalayana and he worked contemporaneously

Now it will hardly be doubted that **Books I III** are decidedly **older than Books IV, V** This is clearly reflected in the native trad tion pre served in Sayana s distinction between the *apauruseyam* character of the first three books and their attribution to the author of the Brahmana It is not possible to say how much this means But it is at least probable that the latest part of the first three books Aranyaka III, belongs to not later than 550 B C and the earlier parts may be dated between 700 B C and 550 B C It will be seen that there is probably a considerable difference in time between the first book and the two sections of the second so that 700 B C is not too early a date for Book I

I do not think that these results need be regarded as in any way surprising The Brahmana period according to Max Muller probably extended from about 800-600 B C and this view has the weighty support of Prof Macdonell[1] The Aitareya Brahmana cannot be far removed in date from the first book of the Aranyaka but the Gopatha Brahmana which contains many borrowings from it is in the opinion of Aufrecht[2] known to Yaska Now Yaska is certainly anterior to Saunaka and Panini for he is cited in the Rgvedapratisakhya[3] the Brhaddevata and is apparently known to the Astadhyayi His date cannot therefore be reasonably placed later than 500 B C and it may go back to 550 B C ?
This date is confirmed by the character of the Nirukta which certainly is anterior to either the Pratiśakhyas or Panini If therefore the Gopatha Brahmana was known to him[4] even that late work must be dated about

1904 p 442) adopts 350 B C. If a late date is adopted then the question of finding a place for the Bha a becomes more and more d fficult cf *J R A S* 1904 pp 435 sq 457 sq and (for the date of the Ep c) ib d 1906 p 2 1907 p 68

[1] *Sa skr t Literat re* pp 12 202 sq

[2] *Aitareya Br h iana* p vi

[3] Weber *I d an Literat ire* p 41

[4] The argument is not certa n It is based on the fact that Yaska N rukta VIII ? quotes Aitareya Brahmana III,

600 B C, and the Aitareya Brahmana must be earlier, even apparently including the last ten chapters which are later than the earliest portions of the Brahmana Thus the Brāhmana cannot well be placed later than 600–700 B C. and the Āranyaka I is not to be dated much later

Further the early date of even the Upanisad portions in Books II and III appears to be only what is to be expected from the history of philosophy The Upanisad doctrines there set forth are essentially earlier than the doctrines of the earliest Buddhism, which belong to the fifth century B C, and we shall see that the Upanisads probably belong to the earliest of the extant works (Sect V) Moreover, Buhler (*S B E*, II, xxvii) has pointed out that Apastamba (? 300 B C) knows the Vedanta school, which presupposes the full development of the Upanisad, while Gautama (before 400 B C.) knows even the Atharvasiras Upanisad, which is cited also in the Moksadharma (*MBh*, *XII* 12864)

## IV. The Mahāvrata ceremony, and the relation of Aitareya Āranyaka I and V to the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka

Sāyana in his commentary on V 1, 1, tells us that there are three forms of the Mahavrata ceremony, according as it is a one day rite, or a part of an *ahina*, or the second last day of a Sattra[1] But he says that the Sattra form is the original or *prakrti* of the others which are *vikrtis* The Sattra differs from the *ahina* in that it requires that all engaged

8, as *yasyai devatāyai havir grhitam syat tam manasa dhyayed vasatkarisyan* Now the *manasa* here does not appear in the original but only in Gopatha Brahmana VIII, 4 *tam manasa dhyayan vasatkuryād* It is hardly open to doubt that the form found in the Gopatha passage must have been before Yaska s mind For though it is not unnatural for the author of the Gopatha, or some other Brahmana, who borrowed the main body of his work from other sources, to alter his original by inserting *manasā*, yet it is improbable that Yaska would have made the quotation incorrectly, but for the existence of the alternative version The instance does not amount to proof, and on the other hand it may be argued, with Bloomfield (*J A O S*, XI, 375 sq, XIX, ii, 1 11), that the Gopatha borrows from the Vaitana Sutra and so is very late But even assuming that the borrowing from the Vaitana is real, yet it is more than possible that the text of the Gopatha, a very unimportant work, has suffered interpolation, or perhaps the Gopatha Brahmana as we now have it is a working over of an earlier Brahmana which itself borrowed from the Aitareya But in any case the Aitareya Brahmana is unquestionably much older than Yaska

[1] For the characteristics of Sattras see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 154, Weber, *Ind Stud*, X, 17, 92 355

should be *dīkṣita*, the Hotṛ being also the *yajamana*, and in that it extends even to a year. In the *ahīna* the Mahāvrata is the tenth day of the Paundarika ceremony, but neither the *ekaha* or *ahīna* form is of importance.

In the Sattra form the Mahāvrata is the last day but one of the Gavamayana Sattra which lasts the whole year, and no doubt represents in some way the year. Hillebrandt,[1] who has most carefully examined this question, concludes that considerable alterations in course of time took place in this ceremony. As it stood later and as it is represented in most of our texts, the two important days were the middle day, the Visuvat, and the last day but one, the Mahāvrata, corresponding to the Summer and Winter solstices respectively. But the Tandya Brahmana,[2] certainly an old work, refers to a view, which it disputes, that the Mahāvrata belongs to the middle of the year, and it is clear that Indra is the god *par excellence* of the Mahavrata. It may be argued with some plausibility that Indra belongs to the beginning of the rainy season, or the middle of June, and certainly the rites of the Mahāvrata show traces of a popular origin, like the celebrations of the Johannistag in Germany.[3] It is not impossible that at one time the Mahāvrata was the first day of the year, when, as the Aitareya Aranyaka, I, 1, 1, has it, Indra slew Vṛtra and became great, and Hillebrandt adduces as evidence of this the month Tisya as compared with the Avestan Tistrya, Sirius.

Once then, in any case, the Mahavrata may well have been a day of popular festival and worship. The Visuvat day receives scant treatment in the texts, possibly, as Dr Friedlander[4] suggests, because the ceremonies connected with that day were transferred[5] to the Mahāvrata to help to wipe out the popular character of that rite. It is, however, simple to suppose that in the usual manner the Brahmanas seized upon

[1] *Die Sonnwendfeste in Alt Indien*, Erlangen, 1889. Cf also Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naksatra*, Berlin, 1862, II, 282 sq.

[2] IV, 10, 3.

[3] Many examples of such ceremonies are collected in Frazer *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p 444, n 1 does not accept this part of Hillebrandt's theory, and it may be pointed out that the Winter solstice is more naturally the time for rites intended in part to increase the sun's heat, cf Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, pp 196, 241 sq.

[4] *Der Mahāvrata Abschnitt des Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka*, p 2, n 5.

[5] Liturgically the Visuvat is the *prakṛti* of the Mahavrata.

the popular Mahavrata and made it their own by an accumulation of purely technical ritual At any rate they have left clear traces of the original nature of the ceremony Warriors, fully armed, pierce with arrows the outstretched skin of a barren cow which is probably a rain spell[1] An Arya and a Sudra strive on a round hide the Aryan proving victorious, which may be interpreted as a spell to produce sunshine Servant maids encircle the Marjaliya fire with jugs of water on their heads either thrice or until the Mahavrata Stotra is finished evidently as a magic rite to procure sunlight and rain for the crops Sympathetic magic is shown in the effort to produce fertility by *maithuna* Music is played and obscene language used, both possibly with the same object to terrify away hostile demons, especially as the form of music affected is drumming

But from the point of view of the Aranyaka these old customs are meaningless survivals The importance of the sacrifice is purely in the ritual as regards the use of the hymns The Mahavrata is one of the forms of the Agnistoma[2] and is therefore divided into three parts the morning midday and evening pressing of the Soma Each pressing has an equal number of Stotras and Śastras The morning pressing has the Bahispavamana and four Ajya Stotras and the Ajya and Prauga Sastras of the Hotr and three Ajya Sastras of the Hotrakas The midday pressing has the Madhyandinapavamana and four Prstha Stotras and the Marutvatiya and Niskevalya Śastras of the Hotr and three Niskevalya Sastras of the Hotrakas The evening pressing has the Arbhavapava mana Stotra and the Agnistoma Saman together with the Vaiśvadeva and Agnimaruta Śastras of the Hotr[3] But in the Mahavrata the morning and evening ritual is mainly derived[4] from the *prakrti* that is ultimately the Agnistoma and it is the Prstha Stotra called the Mahavrata Saman and the corresponding Niskevalaya Sastra or Mahaduktha which form the important part of the liturgy

[1] Cf the account in Oldenberg *Religion des Veda*, pp 444 445 506 whose explanations are slightly different and my note on V 1 5

[2] See for it Hillebrandt op cit pp 124 sq It is a *prakrti* of all the more elaborate forms and these again are related as *prakrti* and *vikrti* in order So the Visuvat is a *prakrti* of the Mahavrata as is the Visvajit

[3] Eggeling *S B E* XXVI 325 gives a comparative table cf Weber *Ind Stud* X 535

[4] This is the explanation of such passages as I 1 3 *ad fin* *ā ta aatkāl ika i ti pasau r ī th un i*

Sānkhāyana Āranyaka[1] When as time went on there was felt the need of a formal exposition of the rite as a whole since in neither the Aitareya nor the Sānkhāyana Āranyaka is the account of the rite intelligible as it stands in the case of the Aitareya, as we have seen, a Sutra like book[2] was added by Śaunaka but in that very book[3] the secret nature of the doctrine is reiterated with the greatest force The case of the Sankhayana Aranyaka is different No addition was made to the Āranyaka, so far as we now know it,[4] but two books, XVII and XVIII, were added to the Śankhāyana Srauta Sutra These books were not commented on by Anartiya but by Govinda, and they cannot be regarded as forming part of the Sutra at his date In fact we have conclusive proof that to Anartiya the eighteenth, and doubtless also the seventeenth book, was an Aranyaka For in commenting on Śrauta Sutra, XIII, 14, 7, he quotes XVIII, 24 30 as an Aranyaka This fact, the full significance of which does not seem to have been realized by Hillebrandt, supports his view, which was based on other considerations, that the two books are not more recent[5] than the rest of the Sutra On the contrary it is at least as probable that they are older[6] but the important consideration is that the Sutra treatment of the material was still considered too secret for insertion in the Sutra We must therefore recognize that at *one time the Sankhayana Aranyaka, in addition to the Brahmana* treatment in Books I and II, contained a Sutra treatment like Book V of the Aitareya As Books III–VI of the Sankhayana contain the Kausitaki Upanisad and correspond to Book II of the Aitareya, and Books VII *and* VIII *of the Śankhayana correspond in some measure to* Book III[7] of the Aitareya, it is not surprising that the Śrauta Sutra treatment of the so called Books XVII and XVIII should have formed part of the Aranyaka

*On the other hand it was not felt that any special sanctity or mystery* attached to the Udgatr or Adhvaryu's functions These are described

[1] Books I and II

[2] Book V [3] V, 3 3

[4] Our acquaintance with the exact form of the Āranyaka is comparatively limited Few MSS are extant Cf. Weber, *Indian Literature* pp 50, 132 Cowell *Kausitaki Upanisad*, Preface p vii *Bodleian Catalogue*, No 976

[5] Hillebrandt *Ritual Litteratur*, p 25

[6] Or of the same date see my note, *J R A S* 1907, pp 410 sq

[7] Weber, *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, II, 5 Friedlander op cit., p 14 Book XVII=III 1, Book XVIII=III 2

in the Samhitās and Brāhmanas of the other schools[1] (see the Tandya Brahmana, IV, 10, V, 1-6, Latyāyana Srauta Sutra, III, 9-12, IV, 1-3, for the Udgātr, and for the Adhvaryu, Taittiriya Samhitā, VII, 5 8-12, Taittiriya Brāhmana, I, 2, 6, 1-7, Kāthaka Samhita, XXXIV, 5, Satapatha Brahmana, IV, 6, 4, 1, VIII, 6, 2 3, X, 1, 2, 1, Kātyayana Srauta Sutra, XIII, 2, 17-4, 2, and scattered notices in Apastamba Srauta Sutra, XXII, XXIII) It is worthy of note that in his explanation of the ritual Sayana freely quotes and follows Apastamba, as he does sometimes in his commentary on the Aitareya Brahmana

The **date of the Sānkhāyana Āranyaka**, like that of the Aitareya, presents considerable difficulty As the Aitareya Aranyaka with the Aitareya Brāhmana, the Sankhāyana is closely connected with the Kausitaki Brahmana Vināyaka, the commentator on the Brahmana actually, in one place,[2] reckons the Books I and II as XXXI and XXXII of the Brahmana, and there are clear references to the Brahmana in the Āranyaka, while several passages agree even verbally[3] But though these signs are so far clear evidence that the connexion is close, they tend also to show that the Aranyaka is dependent on the Brahmana, and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that at the time of Panini (about 350 B C), there seems to have been known to him[4] a Brahmana of thirty chapters, which Weber[5] must be right in considering to be the Kausitaki Therefore the Aranyaka must stand to the Kausitaki in precisely the same relation as the Aitareya Aranyaka to its Brahmana

Now the **relation in time of the Aitareya and Kausītaki Brāhmanas**[6] is still open to discussion The evidence seems to me, however, decidedly in favour of the priority of the Aitareya though that priority is not in all probability a great one (1) The Sankhayana is a more elaborate work than the Aitareya, it is completed by treating of the Haviryajña as well as of the Soma sacrifice proper, giving the Agnyadhana the Darsapurnamasa, and the Caturmasyani It is more probable that the less systematic Aitareya is the earlier (2) The Sankhayana seems,

[1] Friedlander p 6, n 3

[2] On Kausitaki Brahmana, V, 5

[3] Compare Aranyaka, I, 2, with Brahmana II, 1, XIX, 4, XXV, 3, I, 4, with V, 9, I, 5, with II, 1, &c.

[4] V, 1, 62

[5] *Indian Literature* p 45

[6] Cf Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 203, 206, Wackernagel, *Altind sche Grammatik*, I, xxx, with whose views I do not agree

as Weber[1] points out, to represent a fusion of the views of Paingya and Kausītaki, whereas these names are unknown to the Aitareya,[2] which appears to represent a less dependent point of view and to show more originality (3) In point of view of style the Śānkhāyana is much more condensed than the Aitareya This fact is open to various interpretations, but on the whole the most probable theory is that the older a work, the less condensed its style, though later again the style becomes freer This argument, which is applied to the Sarvanukramani and Katyāyana Srauta Sutra by Prof Macdonell[3] appears to me to hold equally well in the case of the Brahmanas (4) The use of unaugmented tenses is more frequent in the Aitareya than in the Sankhayana[4] In favour of the priority of the Sankhayana the only prima facie piece of evidence[5] appears to be the argument from the use of the perfect as a narrative tense Now I do not dispute the value of this criterion, as the evidence appears to me adequate that so far as Vedic is concerned, the history of the perfect is that of an originally present force, such as persisted in words like *aha* or *veda*, to a narrative use The perfect in narrative is indeed known to the oldest language, but the growth of the narrative use is decidedly a mark of lateness, and is accepted as such by Wackernagel[6] But the facts of the case are that in the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya the use of the perfect is usually that of a present and that it is only in the last ten that the perfect is used for narrative, whereas in the Kausitaki Brahmana there are nearly three perfects for every five imperfects The narrative of Śunahśepa in Book XXXIII is carried on in perfects but it is universally admitted that the last ten Adhyayas are a later addition, since (1) they have no corresponding

[1] *Indian Literature*, p 46

[2] *According to Aufrecht's Index* Cf Weber, l c.

[3] *Brhaddevatā* I, xxii This is borne out by the fact that Panini who is probably later than Katyayana reaches a further degree of unintelligibility

[4] Aufrecht *Aitareya Brāhmana* p 429 The omission in the late Jaiminiya Brahmana is merely a MS error Whitney *P A O S*., May 1883 p xi

[5] On the use of *at im °yita dsr* in the late Book VII with periphrastic perfect &c. cf Whitney, l c. The *Jaiminiya* Brahmana has no claim to be deemed early, cf Oertel, *J A O S* XVIII, i, 25, XIX ii, 103

[6] *Altindische Grammatik*, I xxx Cf. Whitney, *Transactions Am Phil Ass*, 1892, pp 5 34 *Grammar*, p 296, *P A O S*, May, 1891, pp lxxxv xcii Wackernagel is wrong in thinking that Whitney does not accept the use as a chronological criterion

matter in the Śankhāyana, while the Sankhayana Srauta Sutra has a version of the Sunahsepa legend and (2) their subject matter is quite unconnected [1] with the functions of the Hotr at the Jyotistoma rite which is the main topic of the Aitareya Deductions from the style of the Aitareya Brahmana taken as a whole are therefore very risky, and Aufrecht [2] has conclusively it seems to me, shown that the Taittiriya Samhita in Book VI, which deals with the Soma sacrifice, follows the Aitareya Brahmana, which has thus a just claim to rank as one of the earliest Brahmanas as it is of course indisputably older than the Satapatha Brahmana and the Taittiriya Brāhmana, the latter being admittedly later than the Samhita, which it was clearly composed in order to complete It is worth noticing that that Brahmana contains in Book III the description of the new and full moon sacrifices which is omitted in the Samhita [3] and it may be considered that this helps to show that the Sankhayana Brahmana in which these rites are treated is later than the Aitareya.

On the other hand no argument either way can be drawn from the prominence of Siva in the Śankhayana [4] since Aufrecht has proved that even the Aitareya Śiva is the great god in his form of Rudra, just as he is in the Satapatha the later books of the Vajasaneyi Samhita and portions of the Atharvaveda It must be recognized that the deity later known as Siva came at an early period to be the most prominent member of the Hindu pantheon and to represent that striving at pantheistic monotheism which in one or other of its forms is so characteristic of all the developments of Indian religious thought It is probable that several conceptions have merged in the idea of the later Siva Originally a god of the storm which destroys [5] he later amalgamated with a god of the forest or wood [6] or rather perhaps with the vegetation spirit which has been rendered so familiar by the studies of Frazer following Mannhardt Possibly, too, traits of his character are derived from the idea of the evil powers of the spirits of the dead, as

[1] Cf Aufrecht *Aitareya Brāhmana* pp iv, v

[2] Op cit, p vi and in the Notes

[3] Cf Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature* p 180

[4] Cf Weber *Indian Literature*, p 45

[5] Cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology* p 77

[6] Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp 216 224

suggested by v Schroeder,[1] who regards him as chief of the spirits of the dead  But at any rate he cannot be regarded as a late deity, just as Visnu also belongs to an early period  Another sign of the fact that no very great distance in time separates the two Brāhmanas may be seen in the fact that both employ in essentials the same style and language  It is worthy of note that in both the base *enad* occurs in the nominative[2]

It seems, therefore, practically certain that at least the first thirty Adhyayas of the Aitareya are earlier than the Kausitaki and the temptation is strong to assume that the fact that the Kausitaki has precisely thirty Adhyayas is due to an imitation of the Aitareya  If this is so then we would be sure that the last ten Adhyayas were later than the Kausitaki a view itself extremely probable on the ground of contents and of the use of the perfect as a narrative tense  But even so the Brahmana as a whole of forty Adhyayas is older than Panini[3] Further the Paingya, who is cited as an authority in the Kausitaki is, according to the Kaśika on Panini IV, 3, 105, a *cirantana*, so that the Kausitaki, like the Aitareya, can claim considerable antiquity[4]

If the Aitareya Brahmana is older than the Sankhayana, it is not unreasonable to expect the same relation to exist in the case of the Aranyakas  This certainly is borne out by comparison of the ritual described  It at least appears to have been deliberately modified to differentiate it from the ritual of the Aitareya  It is not of course conclusive that the Aranyaka itself is necessarily later, since the description of the earlier ritual may be the later, but there is nothing to suggest that this is the case, and the condensed style of the Sankhayana appears more modern than that of the Aitareya

Even in the Brahmanas the ritual differences begin to appear  The Prauga Sastra at the Pratahsavana of the Agnistoma and of the Visuvat, following the model of the Agnistoma consists of Rgveda I, 2 and 3, in *gayatri* metre[5]  In the Visuvat, according to the Kausitaki Brahmana,[6] the Sastra is in *tristubh* metre, though the other form is mentioned as

[1] *Vienna Oriental Journal*, IX 248

[2] Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, p 429  As the Aitareya example occurs in VII, 22 it is possible that it is a case of imitation  In VII, 17 the periphrastic perfect with *asa* occurs, a very late form Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1074 d.

[3] V, 1 62

[4] Cf Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII 455

[5] Bergaigne, *Journal Asiatique* VIII, 13 Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 29 Kausitaki Brahmana XIV, 5

[6] XXV, 3

more correct, and consists of verses from different hymns on the model of the Aitareya form. But most of the differences[1] occur in connexion with the most important part of the Āraṇyaka, the Mahaduktha. Govinda, the commentator on the Śāṅkhāyana Srauta Sutra, tells us[2] that the parts of the Mahaduktha are the parts of the human form and not of the bird form. This is borne out by the words used, *akṣā*, *bāhū*, *prahastakam*, and the omission of the *vijarah* and *pucham*. The bird form is the older; it is that of the fire altar and of the Mahavrata Sāman, and probably it is to the change of form that the confusion in the Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka is due.

In the Aitareya the Mahaduktha is divided into parts corresponding to the body, neck, head, vertebrae, wings, stomach, then comes the food of the bird in the form of the three *aśītis*, the *vaśa* hymn, and ten miscellaneous hymns called the *uru*. The Sankhāyana divides the Uktha into the body, head with neck, the two sides, divided into shoulder, arm, and hand, the back, consisting of the *caturuttaram*, the food in the form of the three *aśītis*, together with the *udara*. Then, as the beginning of the end, come the *dvipadas*, which in the Aitareya form the tail, the *Aindragna sukta*, the beginning of the *uru* in the Aitareya, and a collection of disconnected groups of verses, *avapana*, *triṣṭupchata*, &c. The explanation of this confusion seems to be[3] that the human form had no *pucha* and required fewer verses for the *pakṣa*, and so the verses necessary to make up the total of 1,000 *bṛhati* verses, required by the rite, were appended at the end. To the alteration in form is probably to be attributed the fact that the sides are composed of equal numbers of verses whereas in the corresponding Sāman one side has the Pañcadaśa, the other the Saptadaśa Stoma, and in the Aitareya one side has 101, the other 102 verses,[4] probably, as Dr Friedlander suggests, because in flight one wing of a bird appears longer than the other.

A similar complication is made in the case of the three *aśītis*[5]. In the Aitareya the *gāyatri* and *uṣṇih aśītis* are composed of eighty *gayatrī* and (with a slight exception) *uṣṇih treas* respectively, while the *bṛhati asīti* contains eighty *satobṛhatī* verses. In the Sāṅkhāyana the *bṛhati asīti* consists of eighty *bṛhatis* and eighty *pragāthas* (*bṛhati* and *sato-*

[1] Friedlander, op. cit., pp. 10 sq.
[2] XVIII, 2, 1.
[3] Friedlander, p. 11, who has discussed very carefully this question.
[4] I, 4, 2.
[5] For the details see notes on V, 2, 3 5.

*bṛhatī*) The additional syllables are added to the *uṣṇih aśīti* which is composed of *gayatris*, *bṛhatis*, and *pragathas*[1] The priority of the Aitareya is quite clear Again in the Aitareya the hymns corresponding to the Bṛhat and Rathantara Samans stand on the right and left wings of the bird in the Śankhayana they no longer correspond to the Sāmans in position, but are grouped at the end[2]

The apparently deliberate divergence from the Aitareya appears also in the treatment of the verses from the Rgveda used in the litanies For example, the *uṣṇih aśīti* in the Aitareya commences with Rgveda VIII, 12 and 13, in the Śankhāyana the order is simply reversed Again in the *vaśa* hymn, VIII, 46, in the Aitareya only vv 1–20 are prescribed, since they alone are addressed to Indra, in the Sankhayana[3] the whole hymn, though vv 21–24 are a *dānastuti*, and vv 25–28, and 32 are addressed to Vayu Similarly at the evening Soma pressing the Aitareya used the Viśvedeva verses, 1–41, of Rgveda, I, 164, only, while the Sankhayana improperly uses all the verses

There is yet another sign of the earlier character of the Aitareya, so far as its Sutra part at least is concerned The Sutra part of the Sankhayana the so called Srauta Sutra when mentioning[4] the various improper rites, says *tad etat puranam utsannam na karyam* | There can be no doubt that this is a clear sign of a more reflective and refined age

Further, the language of the Sankhayana suggests a close relation with the Aitareya, which must either be due to a common source, or perhaps more probably to borrowing For example, in the Aitareya[5] occurs *brahmaitad ahar brahmanaiva tad brahma pratipadyate*, in the Sankhayana,[6] *brahmaitad ahar brahmanaiva tad brahma samardhayati* On the whole the priority probably lies with the Aitareya

If, as seems clearly the case the ritual of the Śāṅkhayana is more recent than that of the Aitareya an interesting question arises as to the relation of the Aitareya I to the Satapatha Brahmana VIII and IX in which the Mahavrata is treated The evidence[7] available on this point is not decisive (1) In IX, 3, 3 19, occurs the expression *yāny aṣṭacatvariṃśat tau caturviṃśau pakṣau* which certainly points to the equality of the *pakṣas*, and, possibly, to the human form as the object of

[1] II, 10. [2] II 11 Vv 29, 31, 33 are also addressed to Indra but they do not run consecutively [3] II, 16. [4] XVII 6, 2 [5] I, 2 2 [6] I 2 [7] Friedlander, op cit p 14

comparison as contrasted with the unequal and longer wings of the bird (2) In the same passage it is said *yani trayastrimśat sa vasah*, and, as we have seen above the thirty three verses of Rgveda, VIII, 64, are employed in the Sankhayana only, the Aitareya using but twenty (3) In the third verse of Rgveda, X, 120, corresponding to the body, the Aitareya, V, 1, 6,[1] omits the second half and fills up the gap with a pada from the verses for the right and left wings The Sankhayana Srauta Sutra, XVIII, 14 7, omits the half verse, and puts nothing in its place, but puts the half-verse together with the second half of the verse called *nada*, Rgveda, VIII 69, 2, before the *dvipadas* Now the Satapatha, VIII, 6, 2, 3, refers to *ardharcau*, which name fits better the case of the Sankhāyana, with its two half verses existing independently, than that of the Aitareya, where two separate pādas (not half verses) are interpolated to make up one missing half-verse Dr Friedlander holds that the other points[2] in the account of the Satapatha, which is far from being a clear one, seem to throw little or no further light on the matter, and it is quite possible that the Satapatha represents a version older than the Sankhayana But he appears to have overlooked one or two indications which tell strongly against this theory It is clear from Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, that the general arrangement of the Sastra in the Mahavrata was similar to that of the Śānkhayana, the *vasa* hymn being followed by the *dvipadas*, the *Anudragna sukta*, and the *avapana* What is still more significant is that the *asitis* are clearly composed in the same way as in the Śankhāyana, for the direction in Sankhayana Aranyaka, II, 10, to take twenty four sets of four syllables from the *kakubh pragathas* has a parallel in VIII, 6, 2, 8 Finally, the priority of the Sankhayana appears definitely established by the fact that in X, 4, 2, 19, the Satapatha distinctly condemns the use of seventeen priests, which, as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 348, n 1) points out, is laid down by the Sankhayana Book X is undoubtedly of the same period as or at least not earlier than Books VIII and IX, and to argue from it to the date of these Books is perfectly fair It would probably therefore be best to regard the Satapatha as exhibiting a version which is later than, but which does not

[1] Not, however, in I

[2] Eggeling, in his translation, *S B E*, XLIII, naturally followed the Aitareya, the only source then available, but save in the points above noted, the Śankhayana does not help

necessarily follow throughout the Sankhayana version, I do not think even that version would satisfactorily explain all the details of the Śatapatha

It does not of course necessarily follow that the Śatapatha is later than the Aitareya Aranyaka I, but on the other hand this result is by no means impossible For by common consent[1] the Satapatha is one of the youngest of the great Brahmanas It is no doubt anterior to Panini, and as far as the controversy[2] over the Sutra, IV, 3, 105 yields any results it is that Katyayana considered that Yajñavalkya was a *purana*, as opposed to a recent author though therein it seems he disagreed with Panini It is abundantly clear[3] that the name Satapatha was well known to Katyayana But there is nothing inconsistent in this with the view that the Śatapatha in its present form may be younger than the Aitareya Aranyaka I It will be seen in Section VI that grammatically the Aranyaka I–III is older than Śatapatha Brahmana, I–V, X, XII–XIV

It is perhaps well here to mention a theory recently put forward by Dr Hoernle[4] He points out that in Satapatha Brahmana XII, 2, 4 10, the word *grivah* which occurs in Aitareya Aranyaka I, 3 4, is used to denote the seven cervical vertebrae, whereas in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda it seems to denote the throat or windpipe This view must he argues have been derived from the medical school of Yajña valkya s day that of Atreya and he refers to the fact that Indian tradition assigns both Yajnavalkya and Atreya to the time of Buddha, the sixth century B C[5] Clearly much stress cannot be laid on this argument as far as it might be applied to fixing the date of either the Aitareya Aranyaka or the Satapatha Brahmana XII For though

[1] Cf Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 203 217 The Jaminiya may be younger cf its use of *ādi* Whitney, *P A O S.*, May 1883 p xii

[2] Weber *Ind Stud* XIII 443 444 *Indian Literature*, p 130 Buhler *S B E*, II, xxxix n, XII xxxv It seems usually to be considered that Kātyāyana was right But the evidence seems rather the other way as Āpastamba calls Yajnavalkya s contemporary Śvetaketu an *avara* and this agrees well with the theory here maintained.

[3] Vārtt La on IV 2 60.

[4] *J R A S*, 1906, pp 918 919. It is hardly accurate to regard Yajnavalkya as the author of the Brāhmana. His opinions are represented—with what fidelity we know not—in part only of it and even that part must have been written by his pupils cf Weber *Indian Literature* pp 120 sq

[5] For Buddha s date see Duff *Chronol of India* p 6, and especially Fleet *J R A S*, 1904 pp 1 sq 355

*grivah* in the former work no doubt refers to cervical vertebrae, as the context shows, yet the passage shows none of the detailed knowledge of the Satapatha (*grivah pañcadasa | caturdasa va etasam karukarani virjam pañcadasam*), to which it is certainly prior, as we have seen on other grounds But the tradition connecting Yajñavalkya with Buddha s date is probably inaccurate, for the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad must, I think, be counted as earlier than Buddha and yet it is later than the mass of the Brahmana, and Yajñavalkya is to it a figure of ancient fame while we are hardly yet in a position to decide the date or opinions of Atreya, since we can scarcely assume that Caraka represents him, through Agnivesa, with much accuracy But it may be noted that the later date of the Satapatha is distinctly indicated by the fact that Apastamba [1] calls Svetaketu a contemporary of Yajñavalkya modern, while the Kausitaki Brahmana which also [2] cites Śvetaketu shows again a connexion with the Śatapatha which denotes its posteriority to the Aitareya

**V The three Upanisads of the Aitareya Aranyaka**

There is some doubt as to the exact designations borne in early days by the Upanisads contained in the Aranyaka According to Max Muller,[3] the distinction is between the Aitareya Upanisad properly so called which fills the fourth, fifth and sixth Adhyayas of the second Aranyaka and the Mahaitareya Upanisad also called by a more general name Bahvrca Upanisad which comprises the whole of the second and third Aranyakas There is no doubt that the term Aitareya Upanisad especially belongs to II 4 6 but the term Mahaitareya or Bahvrca brahmana Upanisad, though it sometimes [4] applies to both Aranyaka II and III, sometimes [5] is confined to Aranyaka II Further the form, Bahvrcabrahmana Upanisad is in the Anandasrama edition given to the Upanisad itself, while on the other hand, in one of the MSS in the Bodleian [6] the second book is described simply as Aitareya Upanisad Clearly the nomenclature was not definitely fixed Book III bore the

[1] Buhler *S B E*, II xxxviii

[2] XXVI, 4

[3] *S B E* I xcvi

[4] e g in Winternitz and Keith *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* No 1011

[5] Winternitz *Royal Asiatic Society Catalogue* p 216

[6] *Catalogue* No 1014 Deussen *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p 13 is incorrect as to Sankara s view

special title of Samhitā Upanisad which is given to it in Śankara's commentary and which it claims for itself by its opening words The term Mahaitareya may have been applied at an early date since it appears to have given rise to the fiction of a Rsi, Mahaitareya, by the date of the composition of Aśvalayana Grhya Sutra, III, 4 but the text of these Sutras is not very certain

It must be recognized that the interpretation of these Upanisads is far from certain or easy They were no doubt originally accompanied in the Vedic schools by explanations which might, had they been preserved, have shown how much we now misinterpret them But it is impossible to regard Sankara s explanations as traditional There must have been somewhere a gap in the tradition This is shown clearly by the fact that Sankara explains all the Upanisads as exhibiting one doctrine, an impossible view, and that Badarayana[1] who in his Brahmasutra does precisely the same thing adopted a different doctrine as the fundamental key to the system All that can now be done is to take the Upanisads and endeavour to extract what seems the most natural meaning from the actual words

In the eyes of Sankara and Sāyana there is no difference in time nor in essential doctrines between the three Upanisads which they regard as one (There are three classes of men says Sayana[2] in the Introduction to Book III, those who desire immediate freedom through the knowledge of Brahman, and accordingly find it by aid of Book II 4-6, those who desire to become free gradually by attaining to the world of Hiranyagarbha for whom II 1-3 is intended, and those who care only for prosperity, for whom the third Aranyaka serves In the Introduction to II, 1, 2, he adds that it lays down aids to the concentration of thought in the shape of the performance of certain upasanas or meditations Such meditation may be of two kinds, Brahmopāsana, or Pratikopasana, the former consists in contemplation of Brahman as endowed with qualities, the latter in considering worldly objects as Brahman whether, as in the second Book they are sacrificial objects or non sacrificial )

It is undoubtedly the case that the Upanisad, II, 1-3 is intended in some degree to supersede sacrifice or rather while assuming sacrifice to

[1] See Thibaut, *S B E.*, XLVIII, Keith *J R A S.*, 1906 pp 499 sq.

[2] Sankara, according to Max Muller, *S B E* I, 200. It is true he follows Śankara, but they are not Sankara s actual words

explain it mystically the mystic meaning being the essential part The path *par excellence* is knowledge of the real meaning of the Uktha Uktha is earth, sky and heaven, its objects are Agni, Vayu and Aditya its *asiths* are food, whereby all is obtained It is also the body, mouth nostrils, and forehead of Prajapati The breath is Uktha and *sattya* and as *brhati* supports all things Purusa II, 1, 7, again creates the earth, fire, the sky, the air, heaven and the sun

In Adhyaya 2, Prana is identified with the authors of the hymns of the Rgveda, the *rcs*, the *ardharcas*, and Indra declares himself to be Prana, and, II, 2, 4, the worshipper is identified with the sun

In Adhyaya 3 the identity of the individual and the Uktha or Prana is insisted upon The growth of self is traced from the sap of herbs and trees through animals which show hunger and thirst, to knowledge in man and after the identification of Uktha and Prana the Adhyaya ends with some obscure verses alleged to treat of the winning of Hiranyagarbha

The precise meaning of the doctrine is hard to decide It appears however, to amount to a vague pantheism, which recognizes the unity of all existence physical or otherwise, and at the same time tends, as pantheistic views naturally do tend, to become a cosmogonism, especially in the account of the powers of Purusa (II, 1, 7) It is too early yet to speak of a clear differentiation of mind and body, though distinct signs appear in II, 3 2 where men, animals and trees are regarded as showing in inverse order the growth of intelligence But the Prana or Purusa does not consist in mind as opposed to body all things exist in him and both mind and body seem equally essential elements

Deussen in *Die Philosophie der Upanishad s*[1] argues that the oldest Upanisads are dominated by a doctrine derived from Yajñavalkya which may be styled 'Idealism' and which may be summed up in the propositions (1) the Atman is the knowing subject within us, (2) the Atman is itself as subject unknown, (3) the Ātman is the sole reality These propositions undoubtedly are found in the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad I-IV, and I agree with Deussen in thinking that they were taken over and partly misunderstood by the Chandogya Upanisad and that the Taittiriya and Kausitaki Upanisads are probably later still[2] Nor as

[1] Pp 209 sq, 357, E T, pp 231 sq, 397 sq

[2] *Ibid*, pp 23 24 E T pp 23 24 The Kausitaki Upanisad, it may be noted, stands in no organic relation to the Kausitaki Brahmana unlike the Aitareya Upanisad see Lindner, *Kausitaki Brahmana*, p ix This goes to prove its later date

other three doctrines, which naturally lead to the recognition that no such thing as transmigration can exist, and that mere knowledge is freedom and there is no consciousness after death

The question arises how far these doctrines have any counterpart in II, 1–3 The answer seems that the Upanisad stands in regard to them all on an earlier plane of development (1) The Ātman is not yet recognized as the unity That is designated as Prana or Purusa, and in II, 3, 2, the Purusa has an Atman which is developed in various degrees in the Purusa according to the diverse forms which Purusa adopts as man, beast, plant, &c There is a pantheistic conception, but it is not one of consciousness as the sole reality (2) There is naturally no trace of the doctrine of the unknowableness of the Ātman (3) What is more important, there is no trace of the doctrine of the unreality of things *Purusa exists in them all, but either he is identical with, or creates* (II, 1, 7) them, and he does not exist outside them The nearest approach to a hint of the later idea is found in II, 1 5, where it is said that if one knows what is Sattya, then even if falsehood is spoken by him, yet he says what is true But it is only a vague hint (4) The doctrine of transmigration cannot be proved to be known to this Upanisad Sankara and Sayana of course assume its existence but the passages can be explained otherwise They are II, 1, 3, *tad idam karma krtam ayam purusah* which most probably means that action is the man, a man is what he does, not a man is what he did in a former birth, which is not really suitable in the context, and 3, 2, *yathaprajñam hi sambhavah*, which I take to signify 'for their experiences are according to their intelligence, a meaning which avoids dragging in a doctrine by no means needed or even intelligible in the context The doctrine of the Upanisad is immortality in another world with the gods, II 2 4, &c

There appears therefore no legitimate room for doubt that the Upanisad, II, 1–3, is anterior to the spread of the Yajñavalkya doctrine and to all subsequent Upanisads which contain that doctrine Parts of the Brhadāranyaka and Chandogya Upanisads may be equally early, for some of their texts contain no reference to transmigration, but it would seem that **Aitareya Aranyaka II, 1–3,** which forms a unity, **is the** 193
**oldest long Upanisad** extant

In the Upanisad proper, II, 4–6, there is clear evidence of a further development of doctrine In Adhyaya 4 the idea is that the Atman

produces everything, cosmogonism in fact In Adhyaya 6 we reach the identifications of Prajñana with Brahman and these two with Ātman We thus have clearly the doctrine that the Ātman is consciousness, for it is intended evidently not to identify reality with the Atman, but, as in Adhyaya 4, in a rough way, to show that all things the gods, the elements men, animals, &c, are dependent on knowledge that is the Atman But there is still no statement that the self is unknowable, that is, the conception of subject as contrasted with object is not yet clear On the other hand the sole existence of the Atman appears in II, 4, 3 where it is asserted that there is no other self But this view carries with it no denial of the reality of things which depend on Atman The Mayā conception is not even implicit Nor is the doctrine of transmigration apparently present It is true that Śankara and Sayana found it in II, 5 *athasyayam itara atma krtakrtyo vayogatah praiti sa itah prayann eva punar jayate tad asya trtiyam janma* | But *itah* must mean 'hence' and the third birth must be in the heaven, an idea of course familiar to the Brahmanas[1] which know nothing of transmigration

There is not, therefore, anything in my opinion in this Upanisad to justify us in assigning it to a later date than the period anterior to the main doctrines of the Brhadaranyaka

In the third Upanisad, III, 1–2 there is little of philosophical interest There is a repeated identification of the incorporeal conscious self and the sun, and there is a distinct assertion that the self is that which hears, thinks, sees, &c, but is not heard or thought, and which is within all beings This gives us (1) the conscious Ātman which (2) is not knowable and (3) probably is all that is real But there is no sign of the doctrine of Maya, nor of transmigration nor of freedom in knowledge On the contrary the fate of the good is repeatedly stated to be prosperity in this world and Svarga in the next So even this Upanisad may be earlier than the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad

External evidence for the dates of the Upanisads is not forthcoming It is true that the first Upanisad presupposes that the Rgveda was already arranged as we have it at the time when the Upanisad was composed but Oldenberg[2] has shown that the Rgveda assumed its present

[1] Deussen op. cit, pp 294 295, E T, pp 326 327, Macdonell *Vedic Mythology*, p 169

[2] In his *Prolegomena* and cf his review of Scheftelowitz's *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda* in *Gott Gel Anzeig*, 1907, pp

in II 6, in comparison with the Aitareya account in II 4, 3, is quite inconclusive Further, the Taittiriya Upaniṣad[1] sets a high value on asceticism, and thus differs from the Aitareya and even the Bṛhadaraṇyaka and Chandogya Historically the earliest view appears to have been opposed to asceticism, which only later was regarded as an aid to knowledge Again in the Śikṣavalli the knowledge of grammar shown is at least as great as that of the Samhita Upaniṣad. Another sign of the comparative lateness of the Taittiriya[2] is the addition of *mahas* to the triad, *bhur, bhuvah svar*

There can, in any case, be no question of the priority of the Aitareya to the Kausitaki Upaniṣad The Kausitaki is decidedly late[3] Adhyaya I is a variant of the transmigration legend found in Chandogya, V, 3–10, and Bṛhadaraṇyaka, VI, 2, which are both late passages in their Upaniṣads[4] The twelve explanations of Balaki Gargya in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II, 1, are expanded to sixteen in Kausitaki IV[5] The *pranasamvada* of the Aitareya, II, 4, is certainly older than either that of the Bṛhadaraṇyaka, VI, 11–14, or the Chandogya, V, 1, or the Kausitaki, II, 12–14, III, 3 The name, *indriya* for the organs of sense first occurs in Kausitaki II 15,[6] and in Aitareya III, 2, 1, and the word *manas* occurs in the sense of an organ, like speech, sight, hearing, instead of the old sense 'consciousness,' in Kausitaki, III[7]

Further it may be noted that in the Aitareya, even in III, 2, 3 there is no hint of the recognition of the Atharva as a fourth Veda Such hints occur in the Bṛhadaraṇyaka, V, 13 and VI, 4 13, and Atharvana occurs in Chandogya, VII, 1, 2, while the Atharvans and Angirases are mentioned in the early text, Bṛhadaraṇyaka, II, 4 10

Other Upaniṣads, including the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, may fairly be left out of account None of them can claim to be older than the Aitareya and many must be much more modern They are marked by a greater formalism of doctrine, accompanied by attempts to graft popular doctrines on to the philosophical conceptions of the Upaniṣads, which were apparently soon found too abstruse for the comprehension of their successors.

[1] I 5
[2] Op. cit, pp 64 65, E T., pp 67–69
[3] Cf. supra, p. 42, n. 2.
[4] Deussen, op cit., pp. 296 sq , E. T, pp 334 sq
[5] *Ibid*, p 80 E. T., p. 87
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 244 E. T., p 270.
[7] *Ibid*, p. 245, E. T, p 272

It may therefore be concluded that the first two Upanisads certainly, and probably also the third, precede the Brhadaranyaka and Chāndogya Upanisads in their main portions, especially the Yājñavalkya section of the former, that they are pre Buddhistic, as is proved both by the contents and the language,[1] and that they date from about 700–500 B C

In connexion with the **relation of the Upanisads to Buddhism** it may be well to trace the **history of the Ātman doctrine.** The derivation of the word is in dispute[2] and throws no clear light on the meaning But at any rate, it is certain that the Indians obtained gradually, doubtless through the phenomena of dreams and swoons and death, the conception of the body being animated by a soul This conception naturally reacted on their views of religion It is impossible to suppose, as is now so often done that the earliest or even an early form of religion was the belief in spirits which take up their abode from time to time in various forms It cannot have been until after long experience that the idea of a disembodied spirit can have been intelligible Primitive man must long have regarded body and mind as one So his earliest worship must have been addressed to things which seemed to him to be able to help or hurt him We cannot believe with Rhys Davids[3] that the early worship of trees was really dryad worship The early believer regarded certain trees as divine, just as he regarded certain animals, like the cow or the snake, as divine because of their beneficent or maleficent powers, and it was only later that the idea of the spirit as separable from the tree or animal appears Once the idea of a separate spirit is arrived at of course the nature of the deity changes, anthropomorphism arises, or other animals or things than that which the deity originally was become his place of abode[4] Further, other abstract deities can arise, and we pass from worship of natural objects to worship of spirits embodied from time to time in natural forms It was not unnatural that the thinker should endeavour to find some common explanation of the vast world of souls, and still less unnatural that he should decide that all souls were identical,

[1] Liebich, *Panini*, ch iii, concludes that the language of the Brhadaranyaka is pre Paninean This incidentally supports the theory of the date of the Aitareya

[2] Cf Deussen *Philosophie d s Veda*, p 285, Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 116

[3] *Buddhist India*, p 226 Cf Oldenberg s view of early religion, *Religion des Veda*, p 37

[4] Hence the fetishism described in Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp 44 47, and cf my article, *J R A S* 1907, pp 929 949, on theriomorphic deities

a subject, and it is no answer that there need be no permanent individual self

The doctrine of *anatta* therefore destroys all the basis of *samsāra*, and is complete proof that Buddhism is entirely dependent on the Upanisads which first clearly develop that view There are numerous other signs of dependence The dialogue form is copied from the dialogues of the Bṛhadaranyaka and Chandogya, and even the style of the Aitareya Upanisad, II 6 *yad etad hrdayam manaś caitat samjñanam ajñanam vijñanam prajñanam medha drstir dhrtir matir manīṣa jutih smrtih samkalpah kratur asuh kamo vaśa iti sarvāny evaitani prajñanasya nama dheyāni*, is a forecast of those intolerable lists of practically meaningless synonyms which disfigure the pages of the Pali Suttas In estimating the causes of the fall of Buddhism,[1] it must, I think, be recognized how great a part was played by the unphilosophical and uncritical nature of the metaphysical doctrine, and by the elaborate mass of inaccurate and fanciful psychology,[2] which the school endeavoured to set up as its contribution to the knowledge of truth The Upanisads contain much that is foolish and meaningless, but they are the first books of a new faith and were fated to be the sources of a system of philosophy whose influence in India is still paramount

It follows with certainty that the **Aitareya Upanisads** are considerably **older than Buddha,** whose date of death is certainly about 487 or 477 B C[3] We must therefore probably fix 600 B C as the lowest limit for their com position, or put 550 B C at the very latest thus modifying slightly the results above reached It is not possible to estimate how quickly thought then worked, but about 50 to 100 years will be required for the development from the earliest to the latest Upanisad, and I incline to fix approximately the dates at from about 700-600 B C for Aranyaka II, and 550 for Āranyaka III Āranyaka I may be somewhat earlier, but not necessarily much earlier, while, as seen above, the Āranyakas IV and V belong to about 450 B C, thus explaining the dictum of Sayana which distinguishes so sharply between the two parts The upper date may

[1] Cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp 319 320

[2] Mrs Rhys Davids in her *Buddhist Psychology* has done much for the study, but the fact remains that it is not worthy of the labour bestowed on it Cf Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, p 581, Louis de la Vallée Poussin *J R A S* 1906, p 944

[3] Cf p 37, n 5

from the Samkhya may be yet it is clear that it was from the Samkhya that Buddhism derived its theory of the soulless entity which yet goes through transmigration For this is precisely the *lingasarira* which alone migrates, *purusa* being a truth utterly dissociated from matter From this point of view also is reached the result that the Aitareya is considerably anterior to Buddhism

Aranyaka I contains, in comparison with the Upanisads, little of philosophic interest It is important, however, to observe that in it *brahman* appears already as a principle of unity In I, *1*, 3 *gayatri* is identified with *brahman* and the Mahavrata day is also identified, because it leads to *brahman* Similarly Vasukra is *brahman* and so is identified with the Mahavrata day There can be no doubt that the *brahman* conception is older than that of the Atman, and that it originally meant the power of prayer, which even in the Rgveda is treated as a spell to bend the gods by its own force to grant what is craved, instead of being considered an appeal to the lovingkindness of the gods That eventually this doctrine was amalgamated with a younger rival, the Atman doctrine, as Oldenberg suggests seems to me undoubted The assimilation is seen complete in the Upanisad II 6 which indicates the length of time which we must assume between the first book and the Upanisad proper

It remains to consider whether any explanation can be given of the connexion with the doctrines of the Upanisad of the Mahavrata rite Some light on this matter is thrown by Prof Eggeling in the introduction to Part IV[1] of his translation of the Satapatha Brahmana He there points out that the Agnicayana and the Mahavrata appear to have been developed in connexion with a doctrine of the production of the world from the sacrifice of Purusa (cf Rgveda, X, 90) which eventually yields the equation of Prajāpati at once to the sacrifice and the sacrificer (cf Aitareya Aranyaka, II, 1, 2) But the sacrifice lasts a year and so Prajapati becomes time and death, and eventually mind Thus the Mahavrata rite is treated in the Aranyaka as specially secret and finds a natural development in the more purely philosophic Upanisads

In conclusion, a few words may be said as to the relation of Aranyaka III to the other Vedic texts of similar content It is of course very closely related to the Śānkhayana Aranyaka VII, VIII, with which it agrees verbally in some parts, showing that both versions go back to

[1] *S B E*, XLIII xii xxvii

a not very distant common ancestor But on the whole the version of the Śāṅkhāyana seems the more modern in several respects [1]

The Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa is certainly a much more recent work Burnell, in the preface to his edition, has urged general considerations for its comparatively late date It shows a considerable advance of phonetic science, and mentions such points as *lopa*, *atihāra*, *rephasandhi*, and *visargopagraha*, while it deals with the *svaras* Three sorts of Saṃhitā are distinguished, the *deva*, *asura*, and *ṛṣi*, an artificial conception The Saṃhitā is also considered as *śuddha*, *aduhsprṣta*, and *anirbhujā* In the last section philosophy has degenerated into meaningless formulae, and the demand for gifts in Section IV is beneath the dignity of the older Araṇyakas and Upaniṣads Nor is it without significance that in so short a text are found *sukhibhavati* and *gulmibhuta*, forms rare indeed in the older texts [2] while the only narrative tense found is the perfect [3] (in III) and the language is classical

The Āraṇyaka III is also in all probability older than Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 3, which appears, as will be seen from the note on III, 1, 2, to be an enlarged version of the older Saṃhita doctrine, although it seems likely that the Upaniṣad is much older than the Saṃhitopaniṣad Brahmana

## VI Style and Grammar

In this connexion it will be sufficient to consider the first three Aranyakas as forming one whole as distinct from the fifth Aranyaka, and to disregard the differences in date among their parts The quotations contained in the fourth Āraṇyaka, and also scattered throughout the rest of the work, may be left out of consideration until later (p 74)

The prose of the Aranyaka is of considerable historic interest The history of Sanskrit prose is one of continual degradation so far as the grammatical structure of the language is concerned Classical prose, whatever the subject matter, whether romance, as in Subandhu and Bana,

[1] I have had available for comparison the MS Sansk. e 2 of the Bodleian Library, described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue* pp 59, 60, and, as I fear Dr Friedlander will not carry out his projected edition, I have not refrained from quotation from the text

[2] Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1093 1094

[3] Cf Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxxi, n 2

clauses takes the place of due subordination, and an inordinate love for parallelism of structure is the chief sign of conscious literary effort (cf II, 1, 4, 4, 3) There is no power of transition from thought to thought, and in other cases it is difficult to tell whether it is the thought which is defective or the language which has failed to express it (cf e g II, 1, 2 *na tasyeśe yan nadyad yad vainam nadyuh*, II 1, 5 *na tasyeśe yan mahyam na dadyuh*) Some defects it shares with all Sanskrit prose Although it has at command a considerable range of particles it fails to use them with any clear discrimination of sense, thus contrasting with the analogous phenomena in Greek literature where a delicate discrimination in the use of particles runs on from Homeric into classical Greek Again, although it commands a wide range of pronominal forms they are not used with any clear difference of sense, and indeed a characteristic of the Aitareya, as of all Brahmana prose, is the use of double pronouns, like *sa esa*, without the slightest real difference of sense from the single pronouns The same result, lack of precision, arises from the free use of the cases of the noun and the absence of prepositions to define exactly the sense intended

But utterly lacking as is the style in precision balance and elegance, and although the Aranyaka is destitute of any attempt at ornament, it has nevertheless a certain fitness to its subject matter The naïve speculations, the vague guessings after truth, the confusion of thought, which make up the matter, are not inadequately mirrored in the harsh abruptness and elliptic brevity of the style and a certain variety is introduced in the frequent quotations of verses intended to bear out the argument

The historical position of the prose is not open to serious doubt It cannot be contemporary with the classical prose of the Kavya type, and it is clearly anterior to the prose of the Sutras This is shown not merely by the disuse in the Sutras of various grammatical forms still found in the Aranyaka but still more by the form of the Sutras The Aranyaka is written in prose as a literary composition, other Sutras consist merely of strings of rules, and though as Dr Knauer in his edition of the Gobhiliya Gṛhya Sutra, and Hillebrandt in his edition of the Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra have shown they can be construed as texts written continuously, still such compositions must be later than original prose works. On the other hand, not only does the Aranyaka

contain fewer grammatical antiquities than the Aitareya Brahmana, but it is written in a more developed style and with a greater approach to a command over the language

The style shows also interesting affinities with that of the Buddhist Pāli Sūtras It is impossible not to recognize in both the same long lists (e g II, 6) of names of mental phenomena, in which thought is hidden under meaningless verbal distinctions Similar in both is the affection for parallelism of structure and the remorseless love of completeness which insists on repeating in every detail ideas applicable to more than one subject in every instance in which they apply, while the set formulae with which the Pali Sūtras open and close have close parallels in the Aranyaka

On the whole the vocabulary of the Āranyaka shows little that is remarkable, a few Rgvedic words are used with direct reference to the passages in the Samhita in which they occur *Visva* is found only in the phrase *viśve devah* and twice in etymologies, I 2, 2, II, 2 1 *Iatha tu katha ca* occurs twice, III, 1, 3, 4 Other interesting words are *ajattah* III, 1, 2, from $\sqrt{}$*jat*, to stretch, *āndam*, III, 1, 2, *addhatamam*, I, 2, 3, *bidale*, III, 1, 2, *batarakani*, III 2, 4, *mañjistha*, III, 2, 4, *sambalhatamah* from $\sqrt{}$*bamh*, I, 4, 1, *bisam*, III 2, 4, and *brsih*, I, 2, 4, where the dental *s* is remarkable, *dutah*, I, 4 1, which is taken by Sayana from $\sqrt{}$*du gatau*, *ulbanisnu*, II, 3, 8, *avajat*, II, 4, 3 which is usually derived from $\sqrt{}$*av*, meaning 'devour, *smitam*, I, 2 2, *vistapam*, II, 1, 2, *viksudram* I 5 1, *vijavah*, of doubtful number, I, 4 1, *sattyam* for *satyam*, II 1, 5, *samanodarkam*, I 5, 3, *stomatiśamsanajat*, I, 4, 1, *antastyam*, I, 5, 1, *ksudramiśram* II, 6, *udbhijjam* II, 6, &c

Throughout between vowels *d* and *dh* are written *ḷ* and *ḷh* This is carefully observed in the best MSS and has been followed consistently In II, 4, 3 *saiso* is supported by the MSS, and in III, 2 4 *mayuragrivameghe* seems to stand for *mayūragriva(h) ameghe*, and cf *acyosthavarabhyam*, III, 1, 3 *Namo astu* is the form in the MSS in III, 1 3, 4, and they read in III, 1, 2 *tasmin ha smin* Irregular lengthening of vowels appears in *iti nu*, III, 1, 2, and *vijujā*, II, 3 8, in the latter case in a verse The sandhi of *au* is peculiar, it becomes *av* before all vowels except *u* or *ū*, when it becomes *a* The same rule is usually followed in the Aitareya and other Brahmanas (Aufrecht s ed, p 427)

In noun and adjective declension there are few irregularities *Atman*,

I, 5, 2, occurs besides *atmani*, II, 5, *śirṣan*, I, 5, 2, also is found *Aksibhyam*, II, 4, 1 (cf Rgveda, X, 163) shows irregular lengthening of the vowel *Āpah*, II, 4, 1, appears to be an accusative as not seldom elsewhere *Aikya*, III, 2, 3, is perhaps a neuter instrumental The **genitive singular** of nouns and adjectives and pronouns which show *ah* in the Rgveda and in the later language have *ai* as usual in the Brāhmanas The only exceptions appear to be *prthivyah* II 1, 7, III, 1, 2, *asyah* and *amusyah*, III, 1, 2, 2, 5 In the ablative is found *brhatyai* II, 3, 6, *asyai pratisthayai*, I, 2, 4, of superlatives *brahmatatamam* II, 4, 3 for *brahmatatatamam*, and *annatamam pratyacyante*, I, 4, 1, are remarkable *Catuspadah* and *catuspatsu* occur in I, 1, 2, with a v l *catuspadah* *Navasraktı* in II, 3, 6, anomalously appears to stand for *navasraktih* *Enat* in II, 4, 3 is apparently a nominative as in Aitareya Brahmana VII 22, and if so *param* is used as a neuter *Nabhyai* with the longer form occurs in II 4 1, in the ablative *Enam* is used almost as an adjective, III, 1, 3 *Imasmai* occurs in II, 3, 7

The **numerals** show certain interesting forms *Ekayā na trimśat* occurs in I, 1, 2, Besides *sapta satani vimśatiś ca*, III, 2, 1, appears *sapta vimsatisatani* III 2, 1, so also *trini sastisatani* (=360), III 2, 1, and *pañca catvarimśatsatani* (=540), III, 2, 2 as usual in the Brahmanas The form *sattrimsatam sahasrani*, II, 2, 4, 3, 8, denotes 36,000, and may be considered, perhaps like *sattrimśatam ekapadah* Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 1, as an irregular use of accusative for nominative, cf *pañcavimśatim samidhenyah*, V, 1, 1

Among **verbal forms** may be noted the Vedic forms, *duhe*, I, 3 2, and *ise*, II, 1, 2, 5, as third persons, both these forms occur in the Aitareya Brahmana As in that Brahmana unaugmented forms occur in *iksata*, II, 4, 1, 3, and *padi*, II, 1, 2 *Upamsasasada* in II, 2, 3 is supported by all the MSS *Abhiyaikhyat* in II, 4, 3 appears, if the reading is correct, to be the aorist of *abhivikhya* with the *ai* augmented *Atrapsyat* and the irregular *agrahaisyat*, II, 4, 3, are examples of the rare conditional The perfects *dādhara*, I, 5, 2, II, 1, 7, and *bibhaya*, I, 3 4, occur also in the Brahmana *Dadrśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, and *mene*, III, 1, 1, are, the former certainly, the latter probably passive The √*kr* alone is used as an auxiliary in the periphrastic perfect viz *upāsām cakrire*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayam cakre*, III, 1, 1 The following desiderative forms occur *Ipsati* II, 3, 2, *ipsantah*, I, 1, 1, *vicikitset*, III, 2 6,

*ajighrksat*, II, 4, 3, *atyajighamsat* II, 4, 3, *abhitirtsati*, I, 3, 1, *bibhatseta*, II, 3 7, *mimamsante*, III, 2, 3, *viruruciseta*, III, 2, 5, and the rare aorist *samadhitsisam* III, 2, 5 which is a distinct sign of antiquity The only intensives are *popluyante*, *sarisrpyante*, I, 3 5, and probably the form *vavadisat*, II, 4, 3, which I take as an aorist subjunctive, also an old form The denominative *patiyasi* occurs in I 3, 5 For the infinitive and subjunctive forms see below There are no irregularities in the use of °*tva* and °*ya* such irregularities being characteristic especially in the case of °*ya* of epic style, not of the Vedic style The gerund in *am* appears in *pranavam* and *chandaskaram*, I, 5, 1 It may be noted that in II, 1, 4, *smah* is substituted for *smasi* of the quotation *Attam*, II, 3, 6, and *apihita*, III, 2 5 may also be mentioned

Very characteristic of the early date of the Aranyaka is the **separation of prefixes** and their verbs It is not normal, the great majority of prefixes are placed immediately before the verb, and I have accordingly printed them as forming compounds But the older tradition survives in the following cases *ati manyeta*, II, 3, 3, *anu yujyate*, II, 3, 8 (in a verse), *abhi samvahanti*, ibid , *a gachati*, *gachatah gachanti* I, 1, 4, *a jayate*, II, 3, 1, *abhi trnatti* I, 3 1, *para bhavati* II, 1, 4, &c , *adhi caranti*, *bhavati jayate* II, 3 1

**Pluti** and the consequent lengthening of the vowels concerned occurs sporadically The MSS differ considerably, like the editions in noting the Pluti, and it has as a rule been considered proper to insert it in the text only where Sāyana mentions its presence

In regard to **syntax** it may be noted that the rules of concord are usually carefully followed as in all old works In II, 1, 7, examples will be found of a masculine and a feminine singular, and a masculine and a neuter singular, being accompanied by a verb in the dual, and a plural masculine accompanies a feminine plural and a masculine singular *Andam* in III, 1, 2, is unusual, as *andah* would be expected, but cf *sarvam asam*, I 5 2, *samanam asitajah*, II, 1 2 In III 2, 4, *etesam kimcid* occurs, although *svapnanam* is to be understood The usual attraction to the number and gender of the predicate occurs in I, 4, 1 *athato vijavas ta virajo bhavanti*, II, 6 1, &c The plural in *adyuh*, II, 1, 2, and *dadjuh*, II, 1, 5, offers difficulties

In the use of the **pronouns** there is little of note The forms of the base *enad* occur frequently, but as in all the Brahmanas the pronouns

are used in a very confusing and inaccurate way Double pronouns are very common e g *sa eṣaḥ*, II, 1, 5, 8, 3, 3, 6, 4 3, III, 1, 1, 2 4, &c., *saisa*, II, 3 6, 4, 3, III, 1, 6, *tad etad* II, 1, 2, 3, 6, 4, 3, *tasyaitasya*, (neut) II, 2, 4, III, 2, 1, (masc) III, 2, 1, 3, *tasya etasyai* (gen) III, 2, 6, *ta etaḥ*, II, 1, 4, 2, 2, 3 3, 4, 2, *etat tad*, II, 1, 8, *tam imam*, I, 1, 2, *tad idam*, II, 1, 2, *ta imaḥ*, II, 1, 1, *tanimam*, II, 1, 1, *so 'yam*, II, 5 1, *seyam*, II, 1, 2, *tasya me*, II 2, 3, *ya eṣaḥ* II, 2, 1, *yo 'yam* III 2, 3 &c *Ya* forms numerous indefinite combinations which are given in the Index, *s v* The usual correlations are *ya* and *sa*, e.g *ye te*, II, 1, 1, &c, *yad tad*, II, 3, 6, &c More unusual are *tad etad yad etad*, II, 1, 2, *yad etad-tad etad*, II, 5 1, *etad yad etad*, II, 3 6, *yad etad tad* II, 3, 7 In one case it is uncertain whether a relative is not omitted, viz II, 5 *ko 'yam atmeti vayam upasmahe*, where *yam* may be read

In case construction there is the usual freedom The accusative denotes duration of time in *śatam varṣani*, II, 2, 1, *samvatsaram ga rakṣayate*, III, 1, 6, where the use of the historic present is to be noted, *ahoratre varṣati*, III, 1 2, where the meaning is 'day and night continuously' The cognate accusative appears in *atyayam ayan*, II, 1, 1, and *kakakulayagandhikam vayati* III, 2, 4 Other uses are *sarvam madhyato dadhe*, II, 2, 1, *enam atikṣaranti* II, 2, 2, *jyotih prakaśam karoti*, II, 1, 8, *ahah śamset* III, 2, 4 More unusual is the use of the accusative as if in apposition to the main sentence as in *iryatam cābhyutthanam ca*, I, 5 1 The instrumental is used with √*stu mahavratena stuvita*, III, 2, 4 The dative is used with √*arc sarvebhyo bhutebhyo 'rcata*, II, 2, 2, and *sarvebhyo rdhebhyo rcata*, ibid which is probably an extension of the usual *dativus commodi* found in the same passage with *kṣarati* The date of 'work contemplated' appears in *punyebhyah karmabhyah pratidhiyate*, II, 5 Other datives used predicatively are practically equivalent to infinitives, see below In *sarvebhyo bhutebhyo dadrśe*, II, 1, 3, 8, the case may be dative or ablative The ablative follows *anyat* in *anyat kuśalad brahmanam bruyāt* III, 1, 3 (cf I, 1, 2) when the double accusative is interesting In III, 2, 4, *atmana ca isya tat kritam bhavati atmana* may stand for *atmanah*, a predicative genitive, or for *atmane*, a *dativus commodi*, the former view is supported by V, 3 3, *atmano hanasya tac chastam bhavati* In either case *asya* is to be taken probably directly with *krtam* and *śastam*, cf *nah proktam*, III, 2, 1, *asya uditam*, II 1, 5 Worthy of note is the construction in

Āranyaka I, 6, there occur—as usually in the rest of the Āranyaka—perfects, *upajagama* (cf *upejaja*) *uvāca*, and *uce* There must be a common source for the two narratives despite the difference of their present forms, and it must have used perfects in narrative Besides these narrative perfects, perfects in the present sense occur in *dadhara*, II 1, 7, *dadrse* II, 1, 3, 8, both of which are conjoined with present tenses

In Aranyaka II, 4-6, occur sixty-one examples of the imperfect from twenty-three forms of nineteen roots (*asit*, *asrjata*, *iksata* (5), *amurchayat*, *atapat* (2), *abhidyata* (5), *abhidyetām* (3) *apatan*, *arjat*, *abravit* (2), *abrutam*, *abruvan* (4), *anajat* (3), *avisat* (5), *avisan* (3), *ajayata* (2), *ajighāmsat*, *ajighrksat* (8), *asaknot* (7), *avayat*, *apadyata*, *apasyat*, *abhavat* (2) The only narrative perfect is *uvaca*, II, 5, and there is one present perfect, *dadhe*, II, 2, 1

In Aranyaka III occur *asramsata* and *adadhat* (2), III, 1, 6, and the present perfects, *mene*, III, 1, 1, *viduh*, III, 2, 5

The two periphrastic perfects *upasam cakrire*, II, 1, 8, and *vedayam cakre*, III, 1, 1, may both be narrative perfects, but the latter may be a present perfect

The results may be tabulated as follows, omitting periphrastic forms, the Slokas in II, 3, 8, are not taken into account The numbers in brackets denote the number of roots

| Āranyaka | **Imperfects.** | **Present Perfects** | **Narrative Perfects** |
|---|---|---|---|
| I, | 7 (5) | 3 (3) | 3 (2, *asa* and *vivyaca* (?)) |
| II, 1, 2, 1-2, 3 | 67 (19) | 2 (2) | 3 (1, *babhuvuh*) |
| II, 2, 3-4 | None | None | 17 (6) |
| II, 4-6 | 61 (19) | 1 (1) | None |

The fair conclusion is that the Aranyaka is older than the later books, VI-VIII, of the Aitareya Brahmana as is indeed probable in view of the much more developed narrative style of the Sunahśepa legend It is probably older than parts (if not the whole) of the Satapatha Brahmana, viz I-V, X, XII-XIV, including the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, which uses the narrative perfect throughout In view of the copious and rich style of that Upanisad with its wealth of metaphor, ease of motion, and dignity, it seems impossible to doubt that it belongs to a much later period than the Aitareya just as we have seen that its philosophic content goes far beyond that of the Aitareya Bearing in mind that the Brhadāranyaka shows considerable evidence of the activity of the Ksatriyas, and that

the perfect as a narrative tense is common in the Epic, it may be suggested that the origin of the narrative use in the Brahmanas is to be found in a borrowing from the style of the old Itihāsa literature It is perhaps not without significance that such legends as that of Śunaḥśepa, Pururavas and Urvaśī (Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 5, 1) Cyavana (ibid, IV, 1, 5), and, in the Aitareya Aranyaka itself, that of Viśvāmitra, II, 2, 3, should be told in perfects It may be noted that in the Śānkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XV, 17 sq, the Śunaḥśepa legend is also set out in perfects. The Brahmana use of the perfect is as a present, while both usages are found in the earlier language of the Rgveda Samhitā The older is undoubtedly the Brahmana use as it corresponds most closely with the use of the Greek perfect as a completed action or state (cf Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p 31)

The **future indicative** is used in its ordinary way as denoting future time in assertions or questions, but the so-called second future never occurs, as it does, e g in the Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana

The **optative** is of comparatively very frequent occurrence. (1) Its use as denoting wish is infrequent, the subjunctive usually being preferred, but (2) its use in directions as a mild imperative occurs passim (3) It is also used in questions to express doubt precisely as is used the subjunctive with which it alternates in II, 4 3 *katham nv idam mad rte syat katarena prapadyai.* (4) Its most characteristic use in the Āranyaka is in the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences In the apodosis it may denote either direction or the potential In all cases the condition is one referring to the future, and is of the type 'If A happens then B will happen, or should be done.' Examples of two potentials are *yadi aśnuvita manyeta*, II 3 3, so III, 1, 6, (with *yad* = if) II, 3 6, III, 2, 2, (with *yatha*) III, 1, 3, 4 Examples of a potential protasis and imperative apodosis are (with *yadi*) I, 1, 1, III, 1, 3, 6, 2, 4, 6, (with relatives) I, 2 2, III, 2, 4, 5, and without any particle *pasyet-drśyetatam-vidyāt*, III, 2 4, with double protasis, *upaśrnuyat yadā śrnuyat vidyat*, III, 2, 4 (5) Arising from this potential use the optative appears as an indefinite, like the Greek subjunctive and optative or the Latin subjunctive This is possibly the explanation of the difficult phrases in II, 1, 2 *na tasyese yan nādyād yad vainam nādyuh*, II, 1, 5 *na tasyeśe yan mahyam na dadyuh* though the meaning might be merely a future Definitely indefinite is III, 2, 1 *yatha śalakamse sarve nya amsah*

*samahitah syuh*, since the apodosis is an assertion of fact (6) An optative of characteristic, that is of result is found in III, 2, 3, *brahmanam kurvita yo pasyet* It will be seen that none of these usages offer any difficulty of explanation on the now generally accepted theory[1] that the optative is originally a weak future in sense

As in other languages the **indicative** can be **used modally**, and in conditional sentences this use is well developed in the Āranyaka In II, 3, 3, *yady antariksalokam asnute 'ty enam manyate* is clearly modal, and is followed by *yadi asnuvita manyeta* So *yatra vihiyete vidyat* in III, 2 4 Hence indicatives are sometimes combined with optatives in protases of conditional sentences, the following occur in III 2 4 *yatra drsyate pasyet na pasyet pasyeta vidyat*, *yatra drsyate abhikhya yeta pasyet, vidyat*, *upeksyeta tad yatha drsyante-yada na pasyet, vidyat*, III, 1, 4, *ya upavadet ceu manyeta aha bruyat* The indicative also occurs in conditions where the fact is asserted in the apodosis (with *yadi*), e g II, 4 3, or when the protasis and apodosis refer to the future, e g *yasmin pasyati-bhavisyati*, II, 1, 4

The only case of a condition in the past which was not fulfilled occurs in II, 4 3 *yad hainad vacagrahaisyad abhivyahrtya haivainam atrapsyat*, &c where the conditional is correctly employed This accuracy in the use of the conditional and generally in the use of the optative is characteristic of an early date

The **subjunctive** is of comparatively frequent occurrence, usually in the first person It denotes (*a*) resolve *pravisama utkramama* II 1, 4, *srjai*, II, 4 1, 3, *adama* (in a relative clause), II, 4 2, (*b*) desire *asani*, I, 5 2, II, 1, 4, 2 2 *asat*, I, 4, 3, 5 1, *apnavani* I 4 3, 5, 2, *avarunadhai*, I, 4 3 *asnavai*, I, 4, 3 (*c*) doubt in questions *bravani*, III, 2 6, *prapadyai* II 4, 3, *vavadisat* II, 4 3 if this is so taken, (*d*) with *ned ucchidyai* I 2 4, *asat*, I, 5 2

The **imperative** occurs several times, but there is no instance of the use of *ma* except in II, 7 1, which is not genuine, where *ma prahasih* (or *prahasit*) is found The Śankhayana Aranyaka, XI, 6, has *mā* with the future

The **infinitive** in *tum* occurs only twice in both cases with the verb

[1] Cf Goodwin *Greek Moods and Tenses* App A This would account for the disappearance of one of the tenses in Latin Teutonic, and Balto Slavic (Lindsay, *Latin Language* pp 511 516)

*śak, saṃdhātum naśakaḥ*, III, 1, 4, *aśaknot grahītum*, II, 4 3 This is consistent with the early date of the Aranyaka On the other hand, as in the Aitareya Brāhmana *īśvara* is construed with the infinitive in °*toḥ*, *bhavitoḥ*, II, 3 5, 6, *cartoḥ*, I, 1, 1, *praitoḥ* II, 3 5 Mention should also be made of a series of datives formed from verbal roots by the affix °*tyai* which serve as predicative datives signifying that to which an active tends viz *klptyai*, I, 3, 8, *abhijityai*, I, 1, 2, *prajatyai* I, 2, 4, 3 1, 4, 4, 1, *saṃtatyai* II, 5, *āptyai* I, 1, 3, 2, 1, 3, 3, 8, *abhyāptyai*, I, 4, 2, *upaptyai* I 3 7, *avaruddhyai* I, 1, 2, &c, *apahatyai* (probably), I, 2, 2 The use of these forms is not precisely that of infinitives but it is analogous and forms a distinct feature of the style of the Aranyaka Similar forms occur in the Aitareya Brahmana

The injunctive, except in the form of the second person plural imperative occurs only in *arjayan*, I, 5, 2

In the use of participles the most characteristic feature is their use in place of finite verbs, a use arising from their employment as predicative adjectives In the following cases the substantive verb is expressed *uktam bhavati*, I, 3 8, II, 1, 5, 8, III, 2, 4, *uditam bhavati*, II, 1, 5, *vista 'smi*, II, 2, 3, *vyaptam bhavati*, III, 1, 3, *samahitaḥ syuḥ*, III, 2, 1, *krtam bhavati*, III, 2 4, *apihita bhavati*, III, 2, 5, *anusakta asat*, I, 5 2 In all these cases the expression means more than the corresponding form of the finite verb would have conveyed, and denotes a completed action whose results persist in the present The accurate use of these forms is a distinct sign of early style. The same remark applies to most of the cases of the use without the copula *sthitam*, I, 1, 1, *pratiṣṭhitam*, I, 1, 2, *pratiṣṭhitaḥ* I, 2, 2, 4, 2, *pratiṣṭhita*, I, 3 4, *viṣṭaḥ*, *vistāḥ*, I 3 8, *aviṣṭaḥ*, *nivistāḥ*, II, 1, 1, *śritaḥ* I, 5, 3, II, 1, 4, *channaḥ*, II, 1, 6, *sṛṣṭau sṛṣṭāḥ*, II, 1, 7 *āttam*, II, 3 6, *avṛtam*, II, 1, 6 *viṣṭabdhaḥ*, *viṣṭabdhaṃ*, II, 1, 6, *sitam*, II, 1, 6, *niviṣṭaḥ*, II, 3, 3, *samahitaḥ* III, 2 1, *vyastaḥ* III, 2, 4, *samparetaḥ*, III, 2, 4, in these instances the effect persists into the present, and no examples of a use like *dṛṣṭa* = 'she was seen, occur In II, 4, 3 *yadi vacabhivyāhṛtam*, &c, the sense approximates very closely to a mere present passive indicative

There is no instance of the participle in *vat* formed from the past participle passive, which is so common later That participle occurs also combined with the participle of √*as* *dutāḥ satyaḥ*, I, 4, 1, *siktam sat*, I, 4 2

In one case the present participle is combined with the √*as* *tapann asmi*, II, 2, 3 expressing a continuing present It is used with √*man* in *śaknuvan manyeta aśaknuvantam manyeta*, III, 1, 4, where the change of case is remarkable Note also *anudgrhnan samdadhad varsati*, III, 1, 2

The **gerund** appears equivalent to a present participle in *humkrtya pratipadyate*, I 3, 1, where the action of the verb and participle are simultaneous (cf my note on the gerund, *J R A S*, 1907, p 164)

The **gerundive** *karaniyam* is used with √*man* in III, 2, 4 Here may be noted the strange form *abhivyaharsan*, III, 1, 6, which has the sense of a future participle and the form of a participle of the *s* aorist No correction seems probable as °*harsyan* (cf Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p 846) is impossible

The use of **conjunctive particles** is marked by the number of combinations allowed as contrasted with the comparatively barren character of the later language In most of them *ha* plays some part Examples are *ha vai*, I, 2, 1, &c , II, 1, 2 &c , III, 1, 2, &c , *na ha vai*, I, 2, 1, 5 2, III, 2, 2, *u haiva*, I 3, 8, II, 2, 4, *evam u haiva*, I, 3, 4, 8, *atho ha vai*, I, 4, 2, *haiva* I 5 2, II, 1, 4, 8, 3, 7, 4, 3, *u ha sma*, I, 1, 1, &c , *evam u ha sma*, III, 1, 2, *ha sma vai*, I, 1, 3, II, 1, 5, 8, 2, 4, III, 2 5, 6, *ha sma*, II, 3 5, 7, III 1, 3, 2, 1, *ha tu*, II, 3, 5, *atha ha*, III, 1, 1, 5, *u ha u*, I, 3, 3, *athapi*, III, 2, 4, *atha khalu*, III, 1, 5, 2, 5, *athatah* I, 4, 1, &c , *atho*, I, 1, 2, &c , *u khalu*, III, 1, 6, *u eva*, II, 1, 1, 2, 1, III, 1, 3, *tv eva* I, 1, 1, 5 2, II, 1, 4, *tasmad hapy etarhi*, II, 1, 8, *utapi*, III, 1, 2, *ahaiva* (?), II, 1, 2

Of single **conjunctions** the use of *ca* is most important The regular use is *ca ca*, a formalism distinctly indicative of age, see I, 1, 4, 2, 3, 3, 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 5 1, II 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 2, 2, 6, 1, III, 1, 1, 6, 2, 3, and in I, 1, 2, *chandah* is in apposition to *brhatim ca virajam ca*. A single *ca* is practically restricted to numerals, e g *vimśatiś ca* II, 3, 6 In I, 2 2, is found *ca ca ca*, and in II, 6, III, 1, 6 *ca ca ca ca* In the *Ślokas in II, 3, 8, appears pad par ca par ca pad u ca* These facts render the usual division of *vayamsi vanguvagadhaś cerapadah*, II, 1, 1, into *ca irapadah* excessively improbable *Iva* is used frequently (see reff in Index V) in a sense hardly differing from *eva*, as is also the case in the Aitareya Brahmana though it can always be translated 'as it were', merely modifying the literal sense of the verb, cf I, 1, 2.

*ciralaram iva vā agachanti* *Va* has the sense 'indeed' as well as that of 'or', but a single *va* is more common than a double *va*, unlike the case of *ca* *Hanta* is used with the subjunctive, II 1, 4, as in the Aitareya Brahmana *Iti* has as usual a large variety of uses, and is never misplaced *Cana* in III, 1, 3, 4, following *na* appears to have the force of 'even' *Kamam*, I, 1, 1, III, 2 4, *vava* II, 2 2, 4 2, and *vava*, I, 3 4, &c., also occur *Aha* is contrasted with *u* in II, 3, 7

The same relative wealth is seen in the case of **correlative particles.** The most common form is *yad tad*, denoting time or cause, or comparison, I 1, 1, 3, 1, II 1, 4, 2, 2, 5 1, III, 1, 3, variants are *yat tena*, III 2, 6, *yat tasmāt*, II, 1, 6, 2, 1, 2, 3 6, III 2 6, more definitely signifying cause So *yad hi tasmat*, II, 1, 3 A characteristic and frequent type of sentence is I, 1 3, *tad yan madhuchandasam śamsati sarvesam kamānam avaruddhyai*, cf I 2, 2, &c *Yatha* is usually balanced by *evam*, II, 1, 6, 3 5, III, 1, 2, 2 1, 5, it stands alone in *yathāndam*, II, 4, 1, *yatha vram angam*, II, 5 1 It is balanced by *tathā* in *yathā prthivi tatha* &c, in II, 1, 2 In I, 3, 1, is *yatha vai evam* *Yatra* either has no correlative, as in III, 2, 4, or is balanced by *tad*, II, 1, 8, *tad utapi*, III, 1, 2, *tadā*, III, 1, 6 *Yada* is balanced by *atha*, II, 5, *yadi ha va api* by *haiva* II, 1, 5, *yad ha* by *haiva*, II 4, 3 In III, 1, 3, 4, occurs the phrase *yathā tu katha ca bruyād abhyaśam eva yat tathā syāt*, where the words *abhyaśam eva yat tathā* practically form a compound adverb

Finally it may be mentioned that the **grammatical terms** *yoṣan* and *vrṣan* are used for feminine and masculine, I, 2, 4, as in Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 2

A comparison of the forms and usages cited above with the valuable list of similar forms in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa given by Aufrecht[1] shows conclusively that the Aranyaka stands on nearly the same footing as the first five books of the Brāhmana It is not so old, e g it has fewer forms of the subjunctive, no infinitives in *-e* or *-ah* or *-tavai*, and none in *toh* after *ā* or *pura*, but it is not much younger The use of the narrative tenses is some argument for its being older than Books VI–VIII, to which otherwise it stands close in point of language, though it is much less developed in style

[1] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, pp 427-431

The conclusion arrived at above on grounds of doctrine that the Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka I, II, is later than the Aitareya Āranyaka I-III, is confirmed by the linguistic tests Generally the two works correspond most closely in vocabulary, and confirm the view that they must be derived ultimately from a common source For example, Dr Friedlander well explains *atiharan* in Śānkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 7, as 'laying across', as it means in Aitareya Aranyaka, V, 1, 4, and not, as explained by the commentator on the Śrauta Sutra, in the sense 'withdrawing' Probably the common source of the two Aranyakas had the word which has survived only in the Sūtra part of the Aitareya, but in both the Sūtra and Āranyaka of the Śānkhāyanas With the forms quoted above may be compared the irregular sandhi *niṣ tad*, I, 8, the noun and adjective forms, *ātman*, I, 8, II, 1, *etasyai devatayai* (gen), I, 8, *adhitaram*, I, 7; *udjatatarah*, I, 7, the datives of end served, *bhogyaya*, I, 8, *santyai*, I, 4, *bhiṣajyayai*, I, 4, *avāptyai*, *āptyai*, I, 2, II, 6, the constructions *iśvarah naparajetoh*, I, 8, *gamiṣyantī bhavati*, I, 8, *upāptā āsan*, I, 6; *śaṃsiṣyate*, I, 5 (cf *śaṃsiṣyantam*, Aitareya, II, 2, 3), *yatha parivyayetdhatte*, II, 16, 1 ad fin, the use of the particles *u vai*, I, 1, 3, *na ha vai*, I, 8, *ha vai*, I, 5, 7, *tathā ha*, II, 1, *u ha*, I, 6, II, 10, the construction of the sentence with *tad yad*, II, 10, the irregular numeral *sapta viṃśatiśatani*, II, 10 As has been seen above the narrative perfect occurs in II, 6, the parallel passage to Aitareya, II, 2, 3, and it occurs also in II, 17 (*provaca*, *jijña*), which may be compared with II, 2, 4, as far as the *provaca* is concerned Whereas however, the perfects in the Aitareya are marked exceptions, there is no other narrative tense in Sankhāyana Further, the language of the Śānkhayana Aranyaka is much more accurate and modern than that of the Aitareya Instead of *ṣattriṃśatam sahasrani* the correct *sattriṃśat* is found, II, 17, there are no subjunctives other than those of the first person, which occur with *ned*, I, 1, as in the Aitareya, there are no irregular forms either of nouns pronouns or verbs, save those mentioned above, the aorist is only represented by *avocam* in I, 6 *Ca* is used in *śastrena ca vratacaryaya*, I, 6, in a way not paralleled in the Aitareya and in that chapter occurs the form *vijijñasam eva cakre*, a periphrastic perfect of the desiderative, a form elsewhere practically confined to the Śatapatha Brahmana After making full allowance for the difference of length, the posteriority of the Śānkhayana is almost certain If, as seems probable,

*brahma*[1] and *brahmam* in I, 5, 6, refer to Brahman and his wife, who perhaps owes her origin to these passages, then a strong argument is added for the later date of the Śānkhayana since the Aitareya does not even certainly know Brahman since the passages in which *brahmā* certainly appears refer to the Brahman priest, and in all the others *brahma* may equally well be read Brahman, however, appears in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 33 1 Books VII–XIII of the Sānkhayana are still later

**Aranyaka V** is written in the regular **Sūtra style** It is practically impossible to understand it without a commentary for as usual the rules are condensed into unintelligibility Characteristic is the weight thrown on single words and phrases, e g *ajapaya vrtā*, V, 1, 4, *asrāhakaraih*, V, 1, 1, and the frequent use of gerunds, besides the piling up of adjectives and adverbial phrases

In Sandhi it appears that *au* before *u* becomes *a*, although here, as in Āranyaka I–III, the MSS and the Anandaśrama edition vary Unusual forms are *atman*, V, 1, 6, *uttare* (loc), V, 1, 2, *vadatyah* without *n*, V, 1, 1, *ardharcyāh*, V, 2 5, meaning 'to be recited by half verses', *brhattkaram*, V, 1, 6, *gāyatrikaram* V, 3 1, *triiyaiarjam*, V, 1, 6, *sa mutah*, V, 1, 3 Of desideratives occur *jijīvuset*, V, 3 1, *jigamişet*, V, 1, 4, and as amended, a desiderative causal *cikirtayiset* V, 3 3 The imperative *prabrutat* occurs in a direction, in V, 1, 5 The feminine genitive form is *āh*, not *ai*

More characteristic is the **pregnant use of case constructions**, when for the sake of brevity everything is made to depend on the mere case relation, e g (accusative) *aiabrthani prenkham harejuh*, II 3 2, *aprakampi*, V, 1, 3, in quasi apposition to the sentence, (dative) *niskevalyaya stuvate*, V, 1, 5, *aiaśyakarmane jigamişet*, V, 1, 4, (abl) *hotrāś caturvimśat*, V, 1, 1, (gen) *mahāvratasya pañcavimśatim samidhenyah*, V, 1, 1, where the irregular *pañcavimśatim* is also noteworthy, (abl and gen) *caturvimśān marutvatīyasyatanah*, V, 1, 1, (loc) *dīksite yajamānaśabdah*, V, 1, 5, *na vatse ca na trtīye* ('in the case of') V 3, 3, (loc. and instr) *anyasu cet samamnatāsu rajanena samna stuvran*, V, 1, 6, cf *bhuyasisu cet stuvran* V, 3 2, other uses are the dative after *dhatte* with *sam*, *sam pakşayoh patanaya*, V, 1, 6, an apposition of whole and part *śakhaya mūladeśena*, V, 1, 4, and *abuddham-asya*, V, 3 2 Very strange is

[1] The form *brāhm ani* is curious and the passage may mean 'the Brahman and his wife' Cf Jaiminīya Upanisad Brāhmana III, 4 9

*śrīyam gor aśvam ātman dhatte*, V, 1, 6, where *goḥ* may be a possessive genitive or a genitive of description

In the verb occur two subjunctives in directions put in the mouth of the sacrificer, *parinayātha*, V, 1, 1, *vinayātha*, V, 1, 2 In V, 3, 2, purpose is expressed by *yathā na* with *hanisyasīti*, a curious but not rare (e g in the Śatapatha Brāhmana) use The optative occurs in directions frequently, and in both protasis and apodosis of conditions, (*a*) with potential force in both, e g *yāvatīr-vā aperan tāvanti jijīvset*, V, 3, 1, (*b*) with imperative force in the apodosis (with *yatra tatra*, and *yatra tu kāmam-tatra*) V, 3 3, (with *yadi*), V, 1, 4, 3 3, (with *ced*), V, 1, 6, (with a relative), V, 1, 5 In V, 1, 4, *yada śrāmyet* is probably indefinite, in V, 3 3, *yady apy adhīyāt na snātako bhavati*, the indicative in the apodosis probably expresses the certainty of the result, in V, 3, 2 the apodosis to *cyaveta ced* is curtailed, so also in V, 2, 1

With regard to participles *jāgarito bhavati*, V, 1, 1, and *upakḷpto bhavati*, V, 1, 3, both denote a past action resulting in a present state *Upalambhamyah*, V, 1, 1, is a sign of comparatively late date, the earlier form being *upalambhyah*, cf Śankhāyana Aranyaka, I, 1 No infinitives occur, but many gerunds, e g V, 3, 3, and in all about 36 instances are found In place of an infinitive there is in V, 3, 2, *ijyayai sampresitah* The past participle passive in *yathetam*, V, 1, 2, 3, is simply the equivalent of a past indicative

The use of particles is comparatively restricted There occur the following combinations *atha ha*, V, 2 4, *thaiva*, *iho eva* V, 1, 6, *ha sma* V, 3, 3, *haiva*, V, 3, 3, *no eva* V, 3 3, *iva* is equal to *eva* in V, 3 2, *aha* occurs in V, 1, 6, *khalu* in V, 1, 6, *kāmam* in V, 3, 3, *punar api* in V, 1 4 In the case of *ca* the single use is the more common, as compared with Āranyaka I–III, in *na vatse ca na trtiye*, V, 3 3 the *ca* may connect with the previous sentence, or be like *śastrena ca brahmacaryaya* in Sankhayana Aranyaka I 6 In V, 1 1, *etaiś caivasvahakarair* (*mantrair*) *ehy madhu iti ca* occurs In V, 3 3, is *na cana*

Among other signs of late date may be reckoned the frequency of the locative absolute, the use of adverbial expressions like *antarvedi*, V, 1, 1, *anuparikramanam* V, 1, 4, *viharanaprabhrti* V, 1, 1, *ananvream*, V, 1, 1, the plural of authorship as found in *nidarsanayodaharisyamah*, V, 3 3, and the use of gerunds like *napitena karayitva* V, 3 3

The same style and diction are found in Āśvalayana's Srauta Sutra, which, like Āranyaka V, consists of a disconnected string of sentences, which, when consisting of more than a few words, are constructed by heaping adjectives on adjectives, adding adverbial phrases, using gerunds, and piling up cases in different senses There is no independent evidence to show that there is any great difference in time between the Aranyaka V and the Srauta Sutra

There seems no reason to suppose that the Aranyaka V is not more ancient than the Sankhāyana Srauta Sutra XVII, XVIII Hillebrandt has, indeed suggested that the Sankhayana Śrauta Sūtra is older than Aśvalayana, and although the last two Adhyāyas may be of different date from the first sixteen, still they are hardly likely to be later, so that, if Hillebrandt's conclusions are sound, the Sutra XVII, XVIII, will be older than the Aranyaka V. But Hillebrandt's reasons are not convincing[1] He points out that as Weber has said, parts of the Sutra are written in the Brāhmana style This refers mainly to Adhyayas XV, XVI, which contain *inter alia* the Śunahśepa legend But even assuming that these books are part of the original Sutra, it cannot be denied that the version of the legend is in no way original, it is merely the same as that in the Aitareya Brahmana, and differs so little from it that both versions must be descended from a common source The part of the Aitareya where it occurs is decidedly later than the first five books. The Brāhmana like style is therefore not to be attributed to Suyajña, the author of the Sūtra Secondly, he refers to the description of the Aśvamedha and of the Purusamedha as signs of early age. But this argument depends greatly for its force on acceptance of the theory that Rgveda, X, 18, 8, can be explained from Srauta Sutra, XVI, 13 and this view is not now usually accepted[2] Thirdly, he points out that the Sutra is not written with the full brevity of the latest Sutra style This is true, but the argument is really in favour of the priority of Aranyaka V For that work is written in a style less condensed than that of Suyajña, and certainly less condensed than that of Books XVII, XVIII Further, it must be admitted that as a Sutra these books are much superior to the Āranyaka V. The ritual directions are far more

[1] Cf my note, *J R A S.*, 1907, pp. 410-413

[2] Cf Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 848, Oldenberg, *Gott Gel Anz*, 1907 p 218, n. 1, see however, Lanman *Sanskrit Reader*, p. 385

precise and detailed, contrasting with the brevity of the directions in the Aranyaka, which mainly concerns itself with a description of the litanies In the Sutra the whole process is gone through methodically while the Āranyaka covers only a part of the field The style is of the usual Sūtra type, it is not in any marked manner more recent than that of the Āranyaka, but it contains practically no irregular forms With the forms quoted above from the Aranyaka the following facts may be compared The Sandhi of *a+r* is *ar*, XVII, 5, 9, 7, 8, of *āu+u* is *a*, XVII, 10, 5, 16, 5, while *tasyah* occurs in XVII, 3, 2, as always in Aitareya Aranyaka V, *tasyai* is found XVIII, 2, 4, 19, and *prathamāyai*, *dvitiyayai uttamayai*, XVIII, 20 In XVII, 3, 12, 15, occur *ghatarih* and *ghatakarkarih*, nominatives with the *s* preserved The locative is used with √*stu* in XVIII, 2, 2, 22, 7, and extended to √*kr* in *atichandahsu kurjuh*, XVIII, 22, 9 Adverbial phrases besides *antarvedi* are *prasalavi*, XVII, 14 16, 15, 4, *antahsadah*, XVII, 4, 3, *nana badhnanti*, XVII, 3, 8, while *jaghanena* is used with the accusative, XVII, 5, 8

Of **verbal forms** may be noted *pratyagrnitat*, XVII, 14 3, *prabrutat*, XVII, 14, 4; *vimimsamanah*, I, 7, 3, *paryesyanto bhavanti* XVII, 4, 8, *bhoksyamana(h) bhavanti*, *dhaksyanto (bhavanti)*, XVIII, 24, 14, 15, the gerundives *prayaniyah*, *udayaniyah*, XVIII, 24, 2, *karyam*, XVII, 6, 2, *deyam*, XVIII, 24 32, the gerunds in *am*, *punarādayam*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5 3, 4, *kakupkaram*, XVIII, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 4, *panktisamsam*, XVIII 6, 4, 14, 4, 17, 5, *gayatriśamsam*, XVIII, 16, 1, and the late simple form *śamsam*, XVIII, 16, 2 Of the uses of the optative that in clauses of purpose with *na* is very frequent, in XVII, 10, 8, *yadi syat mimite*, it is purely indefinite, in *yadi na vidyeta ya etam dhiyam kuryat sa etat kuryat*, XVII, 5, 4, the second optative is one of characteristic 'one who can do' In XVIII, 24, 15, *yadi dhaksyanto (bhavanti) syat* the protasis is future in fact and the apodosis is equivalent to a mild future In XVIII, 23, 4, *yadi yajñayajñiyam kuryus tasyoktau stotriyanurupau*, the real apodosis is suppressed Of particles may be noticed the use of *api va*, XVIII, 3, 4, and of *yady u vai*, XVIII, 7, 17, 23, 5 It may be noted as a sign of more recent date that very few particles occur, *ha* only in XVII, 13, 8, *u ha* in XVIII, 2, 3, 5 In XVII, 9, 7, XVIII, 22 10, is found the remarkable phrase *iti nv a u Marutvatīyam, Vaiśvavedam*, in XVII, 1, 5, *athapi*, in XVIII, 20, 6, *atho*

The results arrived at may be supported by a comparison with a work

of date somewhat later than the Āranyaka V, the Brhaddevatā, which shows a style much more modern, even despite poetic licences than the Āranyaka I-III, but which is still in vocabulary an archaic work, coeval in date with the early epic An interesting list of its irregularities is given by Prof Macdonell,[1] but they are rather of the epic type, e g use of *°ya* for *°tva* in the gerund, nominative for accusative, unaugmented pasts, &c It is significant that (1) no genitives or ablatives for *a, i, ū*, stems in *ai* occur, (2) there are no subjunctive forms other than first person forms, (3) the infinitive in *°tum* is common and no other form is found, while in VI, 37, even *śaptukamah* occurs Significant also is the use of the narrative tenses The aorist occurs only in the later narrative use and is rare, being formed only from the roots *ga, bhu, vac, radh* The perfect surpasses the imperfect in frequency as a narrative tense, for in some 340 lines of narrative[2] there occur 202 perfects to 150 imperfects, and the proportion elsewhere is not materially different. Further, the periphrastic perfect with *asa* is frequent *kamayam asa*, VI 76, *utsadayam asa* VII, 53, *śikṣayam asa*, III, 84, *bodhayam asa* VI, 37, *tarayam āsa*, VI 38, *chandayam asuh*, VII, 157, *prasadayam asa*, VIII, 3, *kirtayām asa*, VI, 24, *prasrapayam āsa* VI, 13, *darśayām asa*, V, 63, while the use of *kr* is very rare, *upamantrayam cakre* V, 20 Further, the past participles passive are freely used to denote action either past or present in place of finite verbs and use is made of the new participial form in *vat, krtavat* occurring in VI 41, VII, 58, VIII, 18, *drstavan*, V, 58, *drstavati*, VIII, 33, *prsta van*, V, 71, *labdhavān*, V, 66, *hatavān*, VI, 152 &c. Prefixes are not separated from the verbs with which they are connected Particles are much restricted in number, and combinations are limited. Mention may also be made of the great development in grammatical doctrine seen not only in the discussion in I as to nouns, &c., and in II, 93 as to particles, but in the use of such forms as *āvi* locative of *au* the case termination, *ayoh* from *e*, the sign of the dual *idi* the root *id*, and so on Indeed it is hard to resist the conclusion that the bulk of the Aranyaka I-III must lie before the more systematic treatment of grammatical questions in Yaska's Nirukta, and a new support is derived for the giving an early date to these books, since Yāska cannot well be later than 500 B C

[1] *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, xxxii.
[2] See the fourth Index to Prof Macdonell s *Bṛhaddevatā*

It has been noted that **Book III** presupposes the Padapātha of the Ṛgveda[1] and also the Kramapātha It is therefore later than Śākalya, the author of the Padapātha This, however, leaves the date undetermined, since Sākalya's date is still uncertain Geldner[2] has recently argued that he dates from the later Vājasaneya period, and not as supposed by Oldenberg from the end of the Brāhmana period, and that he was a contemporary of the Aruni and Yājñavalkya known from the Brāhmanas But it is extremely hard to reconcile this with the facts that the Padapātha presupposes the Samhitā, that the Samhitā exhibits a text which cannot be reconciled with the statements of the Brāhmana texts[3] as to the number of syllables in word groups, in consequence of the Sandhi carried out in the Samhitā The evidence, therefore, is certainly in favour of Oldenberg's hypothesis, but it leaves the lower date of Śākalya vague He is, however, cited by Yāska and older than Śaunaka, so that in all probability he must date not later than 600 B C The Āranyaka III need not be much later than Sākalya, and if it is, as seems most probable, earlier than Yaska, it may be dated from about 600–550 B C It may be added that it must be older than the Taittiriya Upanisad and the Sānkhāyana Aranyaka, VII, VIII (see note on III, 1, 2)

These **chronological results** are admittedly uncertain They are based on the views that (1) the Aranyaka I–III is older than Buddhism by reason of the undeveloped character of its philosophic content, (2) that these books are older than the Brhaddevatā and Śaunaka, who may be dated about 450–400 B C, and probably older than Yaska, who can hardly be brought down lower than 550–500 B C, (3) that they are older than the developed systems of philosophy whose beginnings are at any rate known to Apastamba, whom Buhler dates in the fourth or fifth centuries B C, and who cannot well, on any view, be later than 300 B C, and that they are older than the Atharvaśiras Upanisad, known, it seems, to Gautama, who is older than Apastamba by some generations, (4) that they are older than Pānini, Katyayana, and Patañjali, who cannot well be dated later than 300, 200, and 100 B C respectively, (5) that

[1] Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, p 380

[2] *Vedische Studien* III, 144 146 See Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp 4, 5, who also supports this view, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, lxv, n 7

[3] Cf Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 49, 50, and note on III, 1, 2

Books I and II date from the later Brahmana[1] period but are probably older than the Satapatha Brāhmana, parts of the Jaiminiya Brāhmana and Upanisad, the Gopatha Brahmana, and the Chandogya Upanisad, and so belong to a comparatively early date.

The **verses and sentences** quoted contain, despite their brevity, a remarkable set of old forms The Slokas in II, 3, 8, and the prose directions in Āranyaka V, are more properly treated as above as part of the main work, with which the latter no doubt coincide in time, while the former are not very much older Of these forms may be mentioned *tanum*, *tanvam* (loc) but *tanvah* (gen) in I, 3, 5, *sarvasyai* (gen) in the verse in III, 2, 5, which is a sign of more recent origin, the compounds *Vdrunaiayvitamam*, *prthivyupardm*, *brahmandbhartrkam*, *iarsdpavitram*, V, 3 2, the forms *arajah* (?), *tujah*, *ati vjdlh*, *rdntjam*, *vdnam* (?), *ddhrsah*, in V, 2, 1 Among verbal forms are the third person singulars *tśe*, *vide*, IV, 1, the first person *stusé*, IV, 1 The curious forms *rñjdse*, *sdmnjase*, *bhuvah*, IV, 1, *duham*, V, 3, 2, the subjunctives *dnuśamsisah*, *parśat*, IV, 1, *jūjosat*, V, 2, 2, *vibhajatha*, V, 1, 1, the injunctives *vidāh* (?), IV, 1, *sprśat* (?) V, 2, 2, *kartana*, V, 2 2, and perhaps *āvit*, V, 1, 1, the precatives, *apjāsam*, V, 3, 2, *bhujāsam*, V, 1, 1 Of noun constructions may be noted, *jaja somanam*, V, 3 2, *svar jajñam iakṣyantim*, V, 1, 5, *iasañ ann*, IV, 1, *prati iam rjīsí*, V, 2, 1 In V, 2 2, *kartana* seems used instead of a dual, in IV, 1, *braiaiahai* needs explanation In V, 1, 1 occur *antarikṣam ivāndpjam bhujāram*, &c, where the predicate adjective follows the gender and number of the nearest noun the object of comparison The uses of *siam* in that passage, of *maricayah*, and of *indh* and *sdmojah* in V, 2, 1, are all unusual The question of the date of the verses in IV, 1, has been dealt with in the note on that passage, and cf *J R A S*, 1907, pp 224 sq, Oldenberg *Gott Gel Anz*, 1907, pp 215 sq

[1] The Brāhmana parts of the Taittirīya Samhitā and Brāhmana, Maitrayanīya Samhitā, Kāthaka Samhitā, the Panca vimsa Brahmana the Aitareya Brāhmana, I XXX and possibly the Kausītaki Brāhmana are earlier

# AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA.

## ॥ अथ प्रथमारण्यकम् ॥

### ADHYĀYA 1.

ओम्[1] ॥ अथ महाव्रतम् । इन्द्रो वै वृत्रं हत्वा महानभवद्य- न्महानभवत्तन्महाव्रतमभवत्तन्महाव्रतस्य महाव्रतत्वम् । द्वे एत-

[1] In R there precede Adhyāya 1 the following शान्ति verses, incorrectly accented, taken from R[1] भूमिंसुपसृशिद्ध्यं इडा नमं इडा नमं ऋषिभ्यो मन्त्रकृद्भ्यो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमों वो अस्तु देवेभ्यः शिवा नः शन्तमा भव सुमृडीका सरस्वति मा ते व्योम सन्दृशि । भद्रं कर्णेभिः ॥१॥ शन्न इन्द्राग्नी स्वस्ति ॥१॥ सुपे जनं स्वस्ति ॥१॥ कया नश्चित्र आ० तिस्रः स्योना पृथिवी स्वस्ति ॥ In B the शान्ति verses appear as Adhyāya 3 in Āranyaka III, at fol 191 a ओं । नमश्शिवाय । ओं उदितश्शुक्रियन्दधे तदहमा- त्मनि दधे । अस्तु मामेस्त्विन्द्रियं मयि श्रोत्रमयि यशः । सर्वस्य प्राणस्तवल चक्षिष्टाम्यनु मा श्रीरुक्तिष्टत्वनु मा यन्तु देवताः । अदब्धचक्षुरिपिरम्मनस्सूर्यो ज्योतिषा श्रेष्ठो दीचे मा मा हिंसीः । तच्चक्षुर्देवहितं शुक्रमुच्चरत् । पश्येम शरदश्शतञ्जीवेम शरदश्श- तम् । अपे इडा मन इडा नम ऋषिभ्यो मन्त्रकृद्भ्यो मन्त्रपतिभ्यो नमो वो अस्तु देवेभ्यः । शिवा नश्शन्तमा भव सुमृडीका सरस्वति मा ते व्योमसन्दृशि । भद्रङ्कर्णेभिः स्वस्ति । शन्न इन्द्राग्नी स्वस्ति । सुपे जनम् स्वस्ति । कया नश्चित्रः कस्त्वा सत्यो मदानाम् । अभी षु णः स्योना पृथिवी भवा सप्रथ इति शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्ति । इत्यृग्वेदे संहितारण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । This Adhyāya is not accented at all in B as would appear from Scheftelowitz's reproduction, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p 167, the accents being wholly omitted from Khila V, 17, 2, onwards as is correctly stated at p 163 In E occur the same verses as in R and B, but in different order First come the verses which are found in R[1], the Ṛgvedic verses (भद्र) I, 89, 8, (शं न) VII, 35, 1, (सुपे) VI, 49 1, (कया, कस्त्वा, अभी षु) IV, 31, 1-3, (स्योना) I, 22, 15 being quoted in full Then follow the words उदितस् down to शतम् and भद्र नो अपि

स्याहू आज्ये कुर्यादिति हैक आहुरेकमिति त्वेव स्थितम् । प्र वो देवायाग्नय इति राद्धिकामः [विशो विशो वो अतिथिमिति 3b

वातय मनः । ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्तिः हरिः ओम् । Instead of सर्वंह E, S, and the other MSS have सर्वः स, °पित for °पिर, and तम् for तद् A begins like R[1], but adds शृणु° यक्ष्व after कर्णेभिः and सुव्रत after जन. It ends पृथिवि भव ओशापिधाना° यसः । इति पूर्वा । At the end of the fifth Āranyaka it has उदितस्— हिसीः as in B, then तच्चक्षुर्देवहित यक्ष्व । त्वमग्ने व्रतपा यक्ष्व । वाङ्मे मनसि — वक्तारम् (as in Āranyaka II, 7) । भद्र नो अपि वातय मनः । शान्तिः शान्ति. शान्तिः इत्युत्त-रशान्तिः ॥२॥ K has, at the end of the fifth Āranyaka, ओं — सन्दृशि as in R[1] Then भद्र कर्णेभिः शृणुयाम देवाः १ श न इन्द्राग्नी भवतामवोभिः १ सुगे जन सुव्रत नव्यसीभिः १ कया नश्चित्र आ भुवदिति तिस्रः स्योना पृथिवी भव १ तच्चक्षुर्देवहित शुक्रमुच्चरत् १ त्वमग्ने व्रतपा असि । भद्र नो अपि वातय मन. । ओं शातिः शातिः शाति । ओं वाङ्मे मनसि (&c as in II 7) । १ ओं शातिः शातिः शातिः । इति शातिपाठः । T has before II, 4 (the beginning of the Aitareya Upanisad) ओं वाङ्मे मनसि (&c as in II, 7, with महासीत्) ending ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्ति. । Then follows आ अग्ने इया नम इया (&c as in R down to अभी षु णः) ending भद्र नो अपि वादय मन । ओं शान्तिश्शान्तिश्शान्ति' । The verses are given in full In U, at the end of II, 7, are added verses as in A from उदित to जीवेम शरदः शत followed by त्वमग्ने व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यज्ञेष्वीड्य' । ओं शान्ति शान्तिः शान्ति । In S the text is as in R with the addition of ओशापिधाना नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः । सर्वस्मै वाच ईशाना चारु मामिह वादयेदिति वायस. ॥ ओं शान्ति. शान्तिः शान्ति. ॥ Cf III, 2 5 S[5], however, has as in R, then follows उदितः— शत as in B, then त्वमग्ने व्रतपा असि देव आ मर्त्येष्वा । त्व यज्ञेष्वीड्यः । श नो मित्र' श वरुण' श नो भवत्वर्यमा । श न इन्द्रो बृहस्पति' श नो विष्णुरुरुक्रमः । वाङ्मे मनसि (&c as in II 7) । S at the end of the fifth Āranyaka has ओं उदितः— ईड्यः as in S[3] then आवदुस्त्व शकुने भद्रमावद तूष्णीमासीन' सुमति चिकिद्धि नः । यदुत्पतन्वदसि कर्करिर्यथा बृहद्वदेम विदथे सुवीराः । शतधारमुत्समक्षीयमाण विपश्चित पितर वक्त्वानाम् । मेळि मदन्त पित्रोरुपस्थे त रोदसी पिपृत सत्यवाचम् । Then comes वाङ्मे &c as in II 7, ending ओं शान्ति शान्ति. शान्ति ॥ In one MS (क्वचित् पुस्तके) the verse शतधारम् follows II 7, instead of preceding it Both

पुष्टिकामः[2] । पुष्टिर्वै विशः पुष्टिमान्भवतीति । अतिथिमिति पदं भवति नैतत्कुर्यादित्याहुरीश्वरोऽतिथिरेव चरितोः । तदु ह स्माह कुर्यादेव । यो वै भवति यः श्रेष्ठतामश्नुते स वा अतिथिर्भवति । न वा असन्तमातिथ्यायाद्रियन्ते । तस्मादु काममेवैतत्कुर्यात् । स[5] यद्येतत्कुर्यादागन्म वृत्रहन्तममित्येतं तृचं प्रथमं कुर्यात् । एतद्वा अहरीप्सन्तः संवत्सरमासते त आगच्छन्ति । त एतेऽनुष्टुप्शीर्षाणस्त्रयस्तृचा भवन्ति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुब्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संदधाति । अबोध्यग्निः समिधा जनानामिति कीर्तिकामः । होताजनिष्ट चेतन इति प्रजापशुकामः ॥१॥

अग्निं नरो दीधितिभिररण्योरित्यन्नाद्यकामः । अग्निर्वा अन्नादः । चिरतरमिव वा इतरेष्वाज्येष्वग्निमागछन्त्यथेह मुखत एवाग्निमागछन्ति मुखतोऽन्नाद्यमश्नुते मुखतः पाप्मानमपघ्नते । हस्तच्युती जनयन्तेति जातवदेतस्माद्वा अह्नो यजमानो जायते तस्माज्जातवत् । तानि चत्वारि छन्दांसि भवन्ति चतुष्पादा वै

here and at the beginning the verses in S are accented with one or two exceptions in the case of the verses not in the Ṛgveda There can be no doubt that these verses form no integral part of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka. Neither R[2], D, F, G, nor L contains the verses. For शिवा नः see Atharvaveda, VII, 68, 3, with Whitney's note तच्चक्षु॰ is Ṛgveda, VII, 66, 16. See also Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1, and Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 4, with Oldenberg's note. Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, I, 30, has पुनर्मामैत्विन्द्रियम् । पुनरायुः पुनर्भगः ।

[2] bis in F, G. [3] श्रेष्ठताम् F, G. [4] असंमा॰ L.
[5] स यद्येतत्कुर्यात् om. G. [6] संवत्सररम् G. [7] जनान् F.
[1] ॰मागछति F, C.

पशवः पशूनामवरुद्ध्यै । तानि त्रीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ते[3] द्वे छन्दसी भवतः प्रतिष्ठाया एव । द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः पशवो यजमानमेव तद्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयन्ति । ताः पराग्वचनेन पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति[4] पञ्चविंशोऽयं पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू[5] द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव[6] पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो पञ्चविंशं[7] वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह्न[8] स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वै एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति[9] । तास्त्रिः प्रथमया त्रिरुत्तमयैकया न त्रिंशन्न्यूनाक्षरा विराट् । न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने प्राणा[10] न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरुद्ध्यै । एतान्कामानवरुन्धे य एवं वेद । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं च विराजं च छन्दो यैतस्याह्नः संपत्तामथो अनुष्टुभमनुष्टुब्वायतनानि ह्याज्यानि ॥२॥

गायत्रं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुस्तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री तेजस्वी ब्रह्मवर्चसी भवतीति । औष्णिहं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरायुर्वा उष्णिगायुष्मान्भवतीति । आनुष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः

[2] लोकनाम् L  [3] om F, G  [4] भवति F G  [5] उरू L
[6] आत्मेव A  [7] पचविंश L  [8] °ह्न स्तोमस् D E F G L here and usually The evidence of the MSS for the dropping of visarga before *s* and a hard consonant is so strong that the practice has been followed throughout after the example of Prof Macdonell's *Bṛhaddevata* I xxvi see above p 10 R and S retain visarga  [9] भवति F G  [10] प्राणा K Cf I 3 7 n 2

क्षत्रं वा अनुष्टुप्क्षत्रस्याप्त्या इति । बार्हतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुः श्रीर्वै बृहती श्रीमान्भवतीति । पाङ्क्तं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुरन्नं वै पङ्क्तिरन्नवान्भवतीति । त्रैष्टुभं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्वीर्यं वै त्रिष्टुब्वीर्यवान्भवतीति । जागतं प्रउगं कुर्यादित्याहुर्जागता वै पशवः पशुमान्भवतीति । तदु गायत्रमेव कुर्याद्ब्रह्म वै गायत्री ब्रह्मैतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते । तदु माधुच्छन्दसम् । मधु ह स्म वा ऋषिभ्यो मधुच्छन्दाश्छन्दति तन्मधुच्छन्दसो मधुच्छन्दस्त्वम् । अथो[1] अन्नं वै मधु सर्वं[2] वै मधु[3] सर्वे वै कामा मधु तद्यन्माधुच्छन्दसं शंसति सर्वेषां कामानामवरुद्ध्यै । सर्वान्कामानवरुन्धे[4] य एवं वेद । तद्वैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च[5] वारुणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति[6] य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति ॥३॥

वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे सोमा अरंकृता इत्येतद्वा अहररं यजमानाय च देवेभ्यश्च । अरं हास्मा एतदहर्भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रवायू इमे सुता आ यातमुप निष्कृतमिति यद्वै निष्कृतं तत्संस्कृतम् । आ हास्येन्द्र-

[1] अथो L. [2] *bis* in F. [3] यान् F. [4] °रुन्धे is the regular form in R, S, and the MSS., and so is followed, cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 231. On the other hand °रुधे, which is always read in R and which occurs sporadically in the MSS., is simply an example of the constant tendency of MSS to reduce consonant groups, and is incorrect. S has °द्धे throughout. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 269. [5] om. F. [6] corr. from °तिष्ठन्ति A.

[1] तिष्कृतम् A.

वायू संस्कृतं गछतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । मित्रं हुवे पूतदक्षं धियं घृताचीं[2] साधन्तेति[3] वाग्वै धीर्घृताची[4] । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । अश्विना यज्वरीरिष इत्यन्नं वा इषो ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै । आ यातं रुद्रवर्तनी इत्या हास्याश्विनौ यज्ञं गछतो य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्रा याहि चित्रभानविन्द्रा याहि धियेषित इन्द्रा याहि तूतुजान इत्यायाह्यायाहीति शंसति । आ हास्येन्द्रो यज्ञं गछति य एवं[5] वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । ओमासश्चर्षणीधृतो विश्वे देवास आ गतेत्या हास्य विश्वे देवा हवं गछन्ति य एवं वेद[5] येषां चैवं[5] विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । दाश्वांसो दाशुषः सुतमिति यदाह ददुषो[6] ददुषः सुतमित्येव तदाह । ददति[7] हास्मै तं कामं देवा यत्काम एतच्छंसति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । पावका नः सरस्वती यज्ञं वष्टु धियावसुरिति वाग्वै धियावसुः । वाचमेवास्मिंस्तद्दधाति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । यज्ञं वष्ट्विति यदाह यज्ञं वहत्वित्येव तदाह । ताः पराग्वचनेनैकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशो ऽयं पुरुषो दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या आत्मैकविंशस्तमिममात्मानमेकविंशं संस्कुरुते । ताभिः प्रथमया त्रिरुत्तमया पञ्चविं-

[2] घृताची A. [3] साधयन्तेति E; साधतेति G [4] धीताची F.
[5] om. F. [6] ददुषा G. [7] तद्दति K. [8] भवति L.

शतिर्भवन्ति[9] पञ्चविंश[10] आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्त-मिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते । अथो[11] पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह्नः स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वै एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति भवन्ति ॥४॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

## ADHYĀYA 2.

आ त्वा रथं यथोतय इदं वसो सुतमन्ध इति मरुत्वतीयस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । ऐकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च[1] किञ्च वारुणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशा-न्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति । प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । इन्द्र नेदीय एदिहि प्र सू तिरा शचीभिर्ये त उक्थिन इत्युक्थं[2] वा एतदहरुक्थवद्रू-पसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्[3] । प्रैतु ब्रह्मणस्पतिरच्छा वीरमिति वीर-वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम् । उत्तिष्ठ ब्रह्मणस्पते[4] सुवीर्यमिति

[9] पंचविंशति भंति A [10] पंचविंशं A. [11] After this P repeats पंचविंशस्—संस्कुरुते. [12] Text, A, R, इति प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः L; इति प्रथम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ K, श्रीं प्रथमोऽध्यायः F; प्रथमोऽध्यायः D, G; हरिः श्रीं E, इत्यैतरेयब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥४॥ इति बह्वृचब्राह्मणारण्यकाण्डे प्रथमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥१॥ S. R has been followed in the text It is of course certain that the divisions and colophons have no claim to be regarded as contemporaneous with the composition of the work, in which the only divisions were probably the Adhyāyas and Āranyakas.

[1] किं च to एतद् is represented by ° in A, and this is regularly done when a passage is repeated or words are repeated The several instances are not noted separately hereafter [2] उक्थे F. [3] रूपं F. [4] ब्रह्मणस्पते—प्र सूनं

वीर्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। प्र नूनं[4] ब्रह्मणस्पतिर्मन्त्रं वदत्युक्थ्यमित्युक्थ्यं[5] वा एतदहरुक्थवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। अग्निर्नेता स वृत्रहेति वार्त्रघ्नमिन्द्ररूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। त्वं सोम क्रतुभिः सुक्रतुर्भूस्त्वं वृषा वृषत्वेभिर्महित्वेति वृषण्वद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। पिन्वन्त्यपोऽत्यं न मिहे वि नयन्ति वाजिनमिति वाजिमद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। अधो उत्सं दुहन्ति स्तनयन्तमक्षितमिति स्तनयद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। प्र व इन्द्राय बृहत इति यद्वै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। बृहदिन्द्राय गायतेति यद्वै बृहत्तन्महन्महद्वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। नकिः[7] सुदासो रथं पर्यास न रीरमदिति पर्यस्तवद्रान्तिमद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। सर्वान्प्रगाथाञ्छंसति सर्वेषामह्नामाप्त्यै सर्वेषामुक्थानां सर्वेषां[8] पृष्ठानां सर्वेषां शस्त्राणां सर्वेषां प्रउगाणां सर्वेषां सवनानाम् ॥१॥[9]

अस्तु मे जरितः साभिवेगः सत्यध्वृतमिति शंसति सत्यं वा एतदहः सत्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। तदु वासुक्रं ब्रह्म वै वसुक्रो ब्रह्मैतदहर्ब्रह्मण्येव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते। तदाहुरथ कस्मा-

om F, G, because of ब्रह्मणस्पतिः following [5] इत्युक्थ *bis* G, वदुक्° A
[6] इन्द्ररूपा F, G [7] कित् G [8] सर्वैषा पृष्ठाना *bis* F [9] This Khanda is numbered 5 in A, D, E F, G K, L, 5 at the end of the commentary in R, and 1 at the end of the text In S both numbers are given throughout. I have kept the lower number for the sake of convenience, as references to the Aitareya have in the past been based on R Cf *Z D M G*, XLII, 171

वासुक्रेणैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यत इति न ह वा एतदन्यो वसुक्रान्मरुत्वतीयमुदयछन्न विव्याचेति तस्माद्वासुक्रेणैवैतन्मरुत्वतीयं प्रतिपद्यते । तदनिरुक्तं प्राजापत्यं शंसत्यनिरुक्तो वै प्रजापतिः प्रजापतेराप्त्यै । सकृदिन्द्रं निराह तेनैन्द्राद्रूपान्न प्रच्यवते । पिबा सोममभि यमुग्र तर्द[4] इति शंसति । ऊर्वं गव्यं महि गृणान इन्द्रेति महद्वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम् । तदु भारद्वाजं भरद्वाजो ह वा ऋषीणामनूचानतमो दीर्घजीवितमस्तपस्वितम आस स एतेन सूक्तेन पाप्मानमपाहत तद्यद्भारद्वाजं शंसति पाप्मनोऽपहत्या अनूचानो दीर्घजीवी तपस्व्यसानीति तस्माद्भारद्वाजं शंसति । कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा इति शंसति । आ शासते प्रति हर्यन्त्युक्थेत्युक्थं वा एतदहरुक्थवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम् । तदु कयाशुभीयमेतद्वै संज्ञानं सन्तनि सूक्तं यत्कयाशुभीयमेतेन ह वा इन्द्रोऽगस्त्यो मरुतस्ते समजानत तद्यत्कयाशुभीयं शंसति संज्ञात्या एव । तदायुष्यं तद्योऽस्य प्रियः[5] स्यात्कुर्यादेवास्य कयाशुभीयम् । मरुत्वाँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणायेति शंसति । इन्द्र वृषभ इति वृषण्वद्वा इन्द्रस्य रूपमैन्द्रमेतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम् । तदु वैश्वामित्रं विश्वस्य ह वै मित्रं विश्वामित्र आस । विश्वं हास्मै मित्रं भवति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । जनिष्ठा उग्रः सहसे तुरायेति निविद्धानमैकाहिकं

[1] वसुक्रेणैतन् G वसुक्रेण तन् F, वाशु° B  [2] वासुक्रान् E  [3] वासुक्रेणैवैतन् E F, वासुक्रैणैवैतन् G  [4] दर्द E  [5] प्रिय स्याद् F, G The omission occurs sporadically in the MSS but has no sufficient authority to justify its adoption

रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि[6] किञ्च किञ्च वारुणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहः शान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति। ताः पराग्वचनेन सप्तनवतिर्भवन्ति सा या नवतिस्ति-स्रस्ताम्स्त्रिंशिन्यो विराजोऽथ याः सप्तातियन्ति यैवैषा प्रशंसा साऽस्य[7] तस्या एव। ताभिः प्रथमया त्रिरुक्तमयैकशतं भवन्ति पञ्चाङ्गुलयश्चतुष्पर्वा द्वे कक्षसी दोश्चाक्षश्चांसफलकं च सा पञ्चविंशतिः पञ्चविंशानीतराणि ह्यङ्गानि तच्छतमात्मैकशत-तमः। यच्छतं तदायुरिन्द्रियं वीर्यं तेजो यजमान एकशततम आयुषीन्द्रिये वीर्ये तेजसि प्रतिष्ठितः। तास्त्रिष्टुभमभिसंपद्यन्ते त्रैष्टुभो हि मध्यन्दिनः ॥२॥[8]

तदाहुः किं प्रेङ्खस्य प्रेङ्खत्वमित्ययं[1] वै प्रेङ्खो योऽयं पवत एष[2] ह्येषु लोकेषु[3] प्रेङ्खत[4] इति[1] तत्प्रेङ्खस्य प्रेङ्खत्वम्। एकं फलकं स्यादित्याहुरेकधा ह्येवायं वायुः पवतेऽस्य रूपेणेति। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। त्रीणि फलकानि स्युरित्याहुस्त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषां रूपेणेति। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। द्वे एव स्यातां द्वौ वा इमौ लोकावद्धातमाविव दृश्येते य[5] उ एने अन्तरेणा-

[6] एतस्मिन् A [7] प्रशसास्यस्या G [8] Numbered 6 in A D E F, G K, L and also in R in text In R in commentary is २

[1] From अय to इति om F From प्रेखत्वं to लोकेषु om G F has प्रेखत
[2] एष R (by misprint? A, D E, K, L S, and R in commentary have text)
[3] लोके L [4] प्रेखत G [5] ये R in text.

काशः सोऽन्तरिक्षलोकस्तस्माद्द्वे एव स्याताम् । औदुम्बरे स्यातामूर्ग्वा अन्नाद्यमुदुम्बर ऊर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै । मध्यत उद्धृते स्यातां मध्यतो वै प्रजा अन्नं धिनोति मध्यत एव तदन्नाद्यस्य यजमानं दधाति । उभय्यो रज्जवो भवन्ति दक्षिणाश्च सव्याश्च[6] दक्षिणा वा एकेषां पशूनां रज्जवः सव्या एकेषां तद्यदुभय्यो रज्जवो भवन्त्युभयेषां पशूनामाप्त्यै । दार्भ्यः[7] स्युर्दर्भो वा ओषधीनामपहतपाप्मा[8] तस्माद्दार्भ्यः[7] स्युः ॥३॥[9]

अरत्निमात्र उपरि भूमेः[1] प्रेङ्खः[2] स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै स्वर्गा लोकाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । प्रादेशमात्रे स्यादित्याहुरेतावता वै प्राणाः संमिता इति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । मुष्टिमात्रे स्यादेतावता वै सर्वमन्नाद्यं क्रियत एतावता सर्वमन्नाद्यमभिपन्नं तस्मान्मुष्टिमात्र एव स्यात् । पुरस्तात्प्रत्यञ्चं प्रेङ्खमधिरोहेदित्याहुरेतस्य रूपेण य एष तपति पुरस्ताद्ध्येष इमाँल्लोकान्प्रत्यङ्ङधिरोहतीति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । तिर्यञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुस्तिर्यञ्चं वा अश्वमधिरोहन्ति तेनो सर्वान्कामानवाप्नवामेति । तत्तन्नादृत्यम् । अन्वञ्चमधिरोहेदित्याहुरनूचीं वै नावमधिरोहन्ति नौर्वैषा स्वर्गयाणी यत्प्रेङ्ख इति तस्मादन्वञ्चमेवाधिरोहेत् । छुबुकेनोपस्पृशेच्छुको हैवं वृक्षमधिरोहति स उ वयसामन्नादतम इति तस्माच्छुबुकेनोपस्पृशेत् । बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेदेवं श्येनो वयांस्यभि-

[6] om. F. [7] दार्भ्य D, E, F, G, K, L. [8] °मपहातपप्मा F.
[9] Numbered 7 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L.
[1] भूमे F. [2] प्रेंख D, E, F, G, K, L.

निविशत एवं वृक्षं स उ वयसां वीर्यवत्तम इति तस्माद्बाहुभ्यामधिरोहेत्। अस्यै पादं नोच्छिन्द्यान्नेदस्यै प्रतिष्ठाया उच्छिद्या इति। प्रेङ्खं होताधिरोहत्यौदुम्बरीमासन्दीमुद्गाता वृषा वै प्रेङ्खो योषासन्दी तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै। प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद। अथान्नं वै प्रेङ्खः[3] श्रीरासन्द्यन्नं चैव तच्छ्रियं चान्वधिरोहतः[4]। बृसीर्होत्रकाः समधिरोहन्ति सद्मसदः। समुत्सृप्य वा ओषधिवनस्पतयः फलं गृह्णन्ति[5] तद्यदेतस्मिन्नहनि सर्वशः समधिरोहन्तीपमेव तदूर्जमन्नाद्यमधिरोहन्त्यूर्जोऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै। वषट्कृत्यावरोहेदित्याहुः। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामपश्यते करोति। निगृह्य भक्षमवरोहेदित्याहुः। तत्तन्नादृत्यम्। अकृता वै सापचितिर्यामध्युष्टाय[6] करोति। प्रतिख्याय भक्षमवरोहेदेषा वा अपचितिर्या[7] पश्यते करोति तस्मात्प्रतिख्यायैव भक्षमवरोहेत्। प्राङवरोहेत्। प्राग्वै देवरेतसं[9] प्रजायते तस्मात्प्राङ[10]वरोहेदवरोहेत् ॥४॥[11]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

[3] प्रेख D, E, &c [4] अधिरोहतः A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S, the commentary shows the reading, yet R has °रोहते. [5] गृह्णति R in text. [6] अधृष्टा F, G. [7] र्यामपश्यते D, E. [8] प्राङ् R in text. [9] देवरेतः सं° (?) S. [10] प्राङ् L. [11] Numbered 8 in A, D, E, F, G, K, L. [12] Text, A, L, R; no colophon, E; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति प्रथम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K.

## Adhyāya 3.

हिङ्कारेणैतदहः प्रतिपद्येतेत्याहुः । ब्रह्म वै हिङ्कारो ब्रह्मैतदहर्ब्रह्मणैव तद्ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते य एवं वेद । यदेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ वृषा वै हिङ्कारो योषर्क्तन्मिथुनं मिथुनमेव तदुक्थमुखे करोति प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । यद्वेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ यथा वा अभिर्दवं ब्रह्मणो हिङ्कारो यद्वै किञ्चाभियाभितितृप्सत्यभ्येवैतत्तृणत्त्येवम् । यं कामं कामयते हिङ्कारेणाभ्येवैनं तृणत्ति य एवं वेद । यद्वेव हिङ्कारेण प्रतिपद्यता३इ वाचो वा एषा व्यावृत्तिर्दैव्यै[2] च मानुष्यै च यद्धिङ्कारः । स यद्धिङ्कृत्य प्रतिपद्यते वाचमेव तद्व्यावर्तयति दैवीं च मानुषीं च ॥१॥[3]

तदाहुः कैतस्याहूः प्रतिपदिति । मनश्च वाक्चेति ब्रूयात् । सर्वेऽन्यस्मिन्कामाः[2] श्रिताः सर्वानन्या[3] कामान्दुहे । मनसि वै सर्वे कामाः श्रिता मनसा हि सर्वान्कामान्ध्यायति । सर्वे हास्मिन्कामाः श्रयन्ते य एवं वेद । वाग्वै सर्वान्कामान्दुहे वाचा हि सर्वान्कामान्वदति । सर्वान्हास्मै कामान्वाग्दुहे य एवं वेद । तदाहुर्नैतदहर्ऋचा न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्येत नर्चो

[1] किं चाधियामिति नुत्सति K. [2] दैव्यै G. [3] Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L. F and G have both 1 and 9. D has 1

[1] सर्वौ F. [2] कामा E, and so regularly when *ś* or *s* is followed by a semivowel or soft mute [3] चन्यान् S. [4] वाग्—वेद repeated in F, G

न यजुषो न साम्न इयादिति । तदेता एव[5] व्याहृतीः पुरस्ताज्जपेत् । भूर्भुवः[6] स्वरित्येता वाव व्याहृतय इमे त्रयो वेदा भूरित्येव ऋग्वेदो भुव इति यजुर्वेदः स्वरिति सामवेदः । तन्नर्चा[7] न यजुषा न साम्ना प्रत्यक्षात्प्रतिपद्यते नर्चो न यजुषो न साम्न एति ॥२॥[8]

तदिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रतिपद्यते । एतां वाव प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी वाचं व्याहरत्येकाक्षरंद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति । तथैव तत्ततवत्या[3] वाचा प्रतिपद्यते । तदुक्तमृषिणा । बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अग्रमित्येतद्ध्येव प्रथमं वाचो अग्रम् । यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते । यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्ध्येव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम् । प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरितीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति ॥३॥[5]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतद्वाव भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठम् । यतो जज्ञ उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्ण इत्यतो ह्येष जात उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्णः । सद्यो जज्ञानो निरिणाति शत्रूनिति सद्यो ह्येष जातः पाप्मानमपाहत । अनु यं विश्वे मदन्त्यूमा इति भूतानि

[5] om. S [6] भुव E. [7] तन्नर्चा A [8] Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 10 and 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

[1] यथैव S[123], तथैवै om. F. [2] अक्षरद्व्यक्षर om. R in text [3] तत्तवत्या L.
[4] °मग्र A. [5] Numbered 11 in A, E, G, K, L, 11, 3 in F, 3 in D. See I, 3, 6

वै विश्व ऊमास्त एनमनु[1]मदन्नुदगादुदगा[2]दिति । वावृधानः शवसा भूर्योजा इति एष वै वावृधानः शवसा भूर्योजाः । शत्रुर्[3]दासाय भियसं दधातीति सर्वं[4] ह्येतस्माद्बीभाय[4] । अव्यनच्च व्यनच्च सस्नीति यच्च प्राणि[5] यच्चाप्राणकमित्येव तदाह । सं ते नवन्त प्रभृता मदेष्विति तव सर्वे वश इत्येव तदाह । त्वे क्रतुमपि वृञ्जन्ति विश्व इति त्वयीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि सर्वाणि मनांसि सर्वे क्रतवोऽपि वृञ्जन्तीत्येव तदाह । द्विर्यदेते त्रिर्भवन्त्यूमा इति द्वौ वै सन्तौ मिथुनौ प्रजायेते प्रजात्यै[7] । प्रजायते[8] प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समिति मिथुनं वै स्वादु प्रजा स्वादु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजां संसृजति[9] । अदः सु मधु मधुनाभि योधीरिति मिथुनं वै मधु प्रजा मधु मिथुनेनैव तत्प्रजामभियुध्यति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । स्वां यत्तनूं तन्वामैरयतेत्यस्यां शारीर्यामिमां छन्दोमयीमित्येव तदाह । अयो तनूरेव तन्वो अस्तु भेषजमि[10]त्यस्यै शारीर्या इयं छन्दोमयीत्येव तदाह । तस्यै यान्यष्टावक्षराणि सा गायत्री यान्येकादश सा त्रिष्टुब्यानि द्वादश सा जगत्यथ यानि दश सा विराड्ढिन्येषु त्रिषु[11] छन्दःसु प्रतिष्ठिता । पुरुष इति त्र्यक्षरं स उ विराजि । एतानि वाव[12] सर्वाणि छन्दांसि यान्येतानि विराट्तुर्याण्येवमु हैवैवं विदुष एतदहः सर्वैश्छन्दोभिः प्रतिपन्नं भवति ॥४॥[13]

[1] एवं A. [2] उदगाद once only in F [3] शत्रूर् R in text [4] सर्वं—बीभाय om. S, clearly by an oversight. [5] प्राण G. [6] वृजन्ति R in text, [7] प्राजात्यै D, om. G. [8] om G. [9] सृजति A. [10] भेषजं E; भेषजां F, G. [11] तुष्टुप् G [12] चव F. [13] Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L, 12, 4 in F, G, 4 in D R has 4 in text and 12 in commentary

ता नदेन विहरति[1]। पुरुषो वै नदस्तस्मात्पुरुषो वदन्सर्वः संनदतीव। नदं व ओदतीनामिती३ आपो वा ओदत्यो या दिव्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमुन्दन्त्यापो वा ओदत्यो या मुख्यास्ता हीदं सर्वमन्नाद्यमुन्दन्ति। नदं योयुवतीनामिती३ आपो वाव योयुवत्यो या अन्तरिक्ष्यास्ता हि पोप्रूयन्त इवापो वाव योयुवत्यो याः स्वेदन्ते[3] ता हि सरीसृपन्त इव। पतिं वो अघ्न्यानामिती३ आपो वा अघ्न्या या अग्नेर्धूमाज्जायन्त आपो वा अघ्न्या याः शिश्नात्प्रसृज्यन्ते। धेनूनामिषुध्यसीती३ आपो वाव धेनवस्ता हीदं सर्वं धिन्वन्तीषुध्यसीति यदाह पतीयसीत्येवं तदाह। त्रिष्टुभं चानुष्टुभं च विहरति वृषा वै त्रिष्टुब्योषानुष्टुप्तन्मिथुनं तस्मादपि पुरुषो जायां वित्त्वा कृत्स्नतरमिवात्मानं मन्यते। ताभिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश[5] हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते। अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह्नः स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वै एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति ॥५॥[6]

[1] पिरहति E. [2] प्लन्दति A. [3] स्विदते A, D, E, F, G, K, L, S, स्वेदन्ते R. [4] पतियसीति D, E, F, G. [5] The words after दश are represented by ° in A. [6] Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L; 13, 5 in F; 13, 4 in G; 5 in D. R has 13 in text, but 3 in commentary.

तद्दिति प्रतिपद्यते तत्तदिति वा अन्नमन्नमेव तदभिप्रतिपद्यते। एतां वाव[1] प्रजापतिः प्रथमां वाचं व्याहरदेकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति। तथैवैतत्कुमारः प्रथमवादी[2] वाचं व्याहरत्येकाक्षरद्व्यक्षरां ततेति तातेति। तथैव तत्तत्वत्या[4] वाचा प्रतिपद्यते। तदुक्तमृषिणा। बृहस्पते प्रथमं वाचो अग्रमित्येतद्ध्येव प्रथमं वाचो अग्रम्। यत्प्रैरत नामधेयं दधाना इति वाचा हि नामधेयानि धीयन्ते। यदेषां श्रेष्ठं यदरिप्रमासीदित्येतद्ध्येव श्रेष्ठमेतदरिप्रम्। प्रेणा तदेषां निहितं गुहाविरितीदमु ह गुहाध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति॥६॥[5]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वै ज्येष्ठं तन्महन्महद्वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। तां सु ते[1] कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वेति महद्वद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। भूय इद्वावृधे वीर्यायेति वीर्यवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरित्युक्थं वा एतदहरुक्थवद्रूपसमृद्धमेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। न्यूनाक्षरे प्रथमे पदे विहरति न्यूने वै रेतः सिच्यते न्यूने[2] प्राणा न्यूनेऽन्नाद्यं प्रतिष्ठितमेतेषां कामानामवरुद्ध्यै। एतान्कामानव-

[1] In A all from वाव — अधिदैवतम् is represented by ° E has only तद्दिति प्रतिपद्यते भवति See I, 3, 3 [2] प्रथमवाचं only L [3] व्याहर इति B in text, व्याहरेत्य G and D pr. man. [4] तद्वत्या F, G. [5] Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L, 14, 6 in F, G; 6 in D It is numbered 4 in B because the number 13 of the previous section was in the commentary printed as 3 !

[1] सुता ते F, G [2] न्यूने प्राणा om F; प्राणाम् B Cf I, 1, 2, n 10

रुन्धे य एवं वेद। द्वे दशाक्षरे भवत उभयोरन्नाद्ययोरुपाप्त्यै यच्च पद्वद्यच्चापादकमिति। अष्टादशाष्टादशाक्षराणि भवन्ति यानि दश नव प्राणा आत्मैव दशमः सात्मनः संस्कृतिरष्टावष्टा उद्यन्ते। अश्नुते यद्यत्कामयते य एवं वेद ॥७॥[3]

ता नदेन विहरति। प्राणो वै नदस्तस्मात्प्राणो नदन्सर्वः संनदतीव। नदं व ओदतीनामिती३ उष्णिगक्षरैर्भवत्यनुष्टुप्पादैरायुर्वा उष्णिग्वागनुष्टुप्। तदस्मिन्नायुश्च वाचं च दधाति। तास्त्रिः प्रथमया पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति पञ्चविंश आत्मा पञ्चविंशः प्रजापतिर्दश हस्त्या अङ्गुलयो दश पाद्या द्वा ऊरू द्वौ बाहू आत्मैव पञ्चविंशस्तमिममात्मानं पञ्चविंशं संस्कुरुते। अथो पञ्चविंशं वा एतदहः पञ्चविंश एतस्याह्न स्तोमस्तत्समेन समं प्रतिपद्यते तस्माद्वे एव पञ्चविंशतिर्भवन्ति। इत्यध्यात्मं पञ्चविंशः। अथाधिदैवतम्। चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः ता एताः पञ्च देवता इमं विष्टाः[1] पुरुषं[2] पञ्चो हैवैता[3] देवता अयं विष्टः पुरुषः। सोऽ[4]चालोमभ्य आनखेभ्यः सर्वः साङ्ग[5] आप्यते तस्मात्सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्य आप्तान्येव जायन्ते। तदुक्तमृषिणा। सहस्रधा पञ्चदशान्युक्थेति पञ्च हि दशतो भवन्ति। यावद्द्यावापृथिवी तावदित्तदिति यावती वै द्यावापृथिवी ता-

[3] Numbered 15 in A, E, K, L; 15, 7 in F, G; 7 in D. R has 5 in text and 7 and 5 in commentary.

[1] विविष्टाः E. [2] पुरुषो K. [3] हैवै K. [4] सोत्र॰ A; सोत्र॰ E.
[5] सर्वसाङ्ग K.

वानात्मा । सहस्रधा महिमानः सहस्रमित्युक्थान्येव तदनुमदति महयति । यावद्ब्रह्म विष्ठितं तावती वागिति यत्र ह क्व च ब्रह्म तद्वाग्यत्र वा वाक्तद्वा ब्रह्मेत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एषां वा एषां सूक्तानां नवर्चं प्रथमं नव वै प्राणाः प्राणानां क्लृप्त्यै । षळृचं[6] भवति षड्वा ऋतव ऋतूनामाप्त्यै । पञ्चर्चं भवति[8] पञ्चपदा पङ्क्तिः पङ्क्तिर्वा अन्नमन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै । तृचो भवति त्रयो वा इमे त्रिवृतो लोका एषामेव लोकानामभिजित्यै । ता अभिसंपद्यन्ते बृहतीं छन्दोऽमृतं देवलोकमेष[9] आत्मा । एवमुहैवैवं[10] विदेतयैव संपदामृतमेवात्मानमभिसंभवति संभवति ॥ ८ ॥[11]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

## Adhyāya 4.

अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातो ग्रीवाः । ता आचक्षते यथाछन्दसमुष्णिह इति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातः शिरः । तद्गायत्रीषु भवत्ययं वै छन्दसां गायत्र्यग्रमङ्गानां[1] शिरः । तदर्कवतीषु भवत्यग्निर्वा अर्कः । ता

[6] षळृचं R in text; षळृचं A, G; पचर्चं F; text, D, E, K, L. [7] ऋतुनाम् R in text; ऋतून् A. [8] om. R in text. It is in R in commentary and in all the MSS. and in S. [9] मेव K. [10] हैवैव K. [11] Numbered 16 in A, E, F, K, L; 16, 8 in G; no number in D. R in text has 6, in commentary 16. [12] इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः A; इति प्रथम आरण्ये (प्रथमारण्यके L) तृतीयोऽध्यायः K, L; तृतीयोऽध्यायः D, F, G; nothing in E, or by an error in R in text.

[1] छन्दसांगानाम् omitting the rest, F.

नव भवन्ति नवकपालं वै शिरः । दशमीं शंसति तक्केशा[2] इत्येव सा भवति । अथो स्तोमातिशंसनाया एव । तौ त्रिवृच्च स्तोमो[3] भवतो गायत्रं च छन्द एतयोर्वै स्तोमछन्दसोः प्रजातिमनु सर्वमिदं प्रजायते यदिदं किञ्च प्रजात्यै । प्रजायते[4] प्रजया पशुभिर्य एवं वेद । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो[5] वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातो विजवः । ता विराजो भवन्ति तस्मात्पुरुषः पुरुषमाह वि[6] वा अस्मासु राजसि ग्रीवा वै धारयसीति स्तभमानं वा यद्वा दृताः सत्त्वाह्वतमाः[7] सत्योऽनततमां प्रत्यच्यन्तोऽन्नं हि विराळन्नमु[8] वीर्यम् । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति ॥१॥[10]

अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । सोऽयं लोकः सोऽयमग्निः सा वाक्तद्रथन्तरं स वसिष्ठस्तच्छतं तानि षड्विंशानि भवन्ति । संपात एव कामानामभ्याप्त्यै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय पङ्क्तिः । अथ[1] सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति[1] । अथात उत्तरः पक्षः । सोऽसौ लोकः सोऽसावादित्यस्तत्मनस्तद्बृहत्स भरद्वाजस्तच्छतं तानि षड्विंशानि भवन्ति । संपात एव कामानामभ्याप्त्यै प्रतिष्ठित्या अन्नाद्याय पङ्क्तिः । ता ऊना-

[2] केश B in text [3] स्तोमौ B in text S [4] om F [5] प्राणो न पर्वाणि omitting the rest F, G [6] Accented in E [7] सत्त्वह्वतमाः B, सचह्वतमाः A, °ह्वैतमाः E, text, D, F, G, K, L S [8] विराड् A B [9] उप K [10] Numbered 17 in A, E, K, L, 17, 1 in F, G 1 in D

[1] अथ — संदधाति om in S though the commentary has it

तिरिक्तौ भवतो वृषा वै बृहद्योषा रथन्तरमतिरिक्तं वै पुंसो न्यूनं[2] स्त्रियै तस्मादूनातिरिक्तौ भवतः । अथो एकेन ह वै पक्षेण सुपर्णस्योत्तरः[3] पक्षो ज्यायांस्तस्मादेकयर्चोत्तरः पक्षो भूयान्भवति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । अथातः पुच्छम्[4] । ता एकविंशतिर्द्विपदा[5] भवन्त्येकविंशतिर्हीमानि प्रत्यञ्चि सुपर्णस्य पत्त्राणि भवन्ति । अथो एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठा पुच्छं वयसाम् । द्वाविंशीं[6] शंसति प्रतिष्ठयोरेव तद्रूपं क्रियते तस्मात्सर्वाणि वयांसि पुच्छेन प्रतितिष्ठन्ति पुच्छेनैव प्रतिष्ठायोत्पतन्ति प्रतिष्ठा हि पुच्छम् । स एष द्वाभ्यां दशिनीभ्यां विराड्भ्यामनयोर्द्वाविंश्योर्द्विपदयोरयं पुरुषः प्रतिष्ठितः । तस्य यत्सुपर्णरूपं तदस्य कामानामभ्याप्त्यै । अथ यत्पुरुषरूपं तदस्य श्रियै यशसेऽन्नाद्यायापचित्यै । अथ सूददोहाः । अथ धाय्या[8] । अथ सूददोहाः । वृषा वै सूददोहा योषा धाय्या तदुभयतः सूददोहसा धाय्यां परिशंसति तस्माद्वयो रेतः सिक्तं सदेकतामेवाप्येति योषामेवाभ्यत आजाना[9] हि योषातः प्रजाना तस्मादेनामन्त्र शंसति ॥२॥[10]

गायत्रीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्ययं वै लोको गायत्री तृचाशीतिर्यदेवास्मिँल्लोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुन्धे तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः ।

[2] न्यूनं G. [3] °स्योत्तरतः R[1]; सुपर्णःस्योत्तरः K. [4] पुच्छम् A.
[5] द्विपदा — एकविंशतिर् om. F. [6] द्वाविंशीं A. [7] द्वाविंश्योर् A.
[8] अथ धाय्याथ सूददोहाः bis F. [9] प्रजाना K. [10] Numbered 18 in A, E, K, L; 18, 2 in F, G; 2 in D.

प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेनेमं[1] लोकं संतनोति । बार्हतीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्यन्तरिक्षलोको वै बार्हती तृचाशीतिर्यदेवान्तरिक्षलोके यशो यन्महो यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिस्तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुणधै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेनान्तरिक्षलोकं संतनोति । औष्णिहीं तृचाशीतिं शंसत्यसौ वै लोको द्यौरौष्णिही तृचाशीतिर्यदेवामुष्मिँल्लोके यशो यन्महो[2] यन्मिथुनं यदन्नाद्यं यापचितिः यद्देवानां देवं तदश्नवै तदाप्नवानि तदवरुणधै तन्मेऽसदिति । अथ सूददोहाः । प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेनामुं लोकं संतनोति संतनोति ॥३॥[3]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥[4]

## ADHYĀYA 5

वशं[1] शंसति वशे म इदं सर्वमसदिति । ता एकविंशतिर्भवन्त्येकविंशतिर्हि ता अन्तरुदरे विकृतयः । अथो एकविंशो वै स्तोमानां प्रतिष्ठा प्रतिष्ठेदरमन्नाद्यानाम् । ता विछन्दसो भवन्ति विक्षुद्रमिव वा अन्तस्त्यमणीय इव च स्थवीय इव च । ताः प्रणावं[4] छन्दस्कार मयोपमादं शंसति यथोपपादमिव वा अन्तस्त्यं ह्रसीय इव च द्राघीय इव च । अथ सूददोहाः ।

[1] In this section the MSS of S appear to have been defective  [2] महो only A  [3] Numbered 19 in A E h L 19 3 in F G 3 in D  [4] Text A R इति प्रथम आरण्ये (प्रथमारण्यके L) चतुर्थोऽध्याय (ऽध्य only L) h L इति चतुर्थोऽध्याय D चतुर्थोऽध्याय F G no colophon E

[1] वश D E L.  [2] असाद् L  [3] एकविंशतिर्भवन्ति om F G but added by G sec man  [4] प्राणाव \ E G

प्राणो वै सूददोहाः प्राणेन पर्वाणि संदधाति । तामन्वोत्सृजति द्वादशकृत्वः शस्त्वा द्वादशविधा वा इमे प्राणाः सप्त शीर्षण्या द्वौ स्तन्यौ त्रयोऽवाञ्चोऽत्र वै प्राणा आप्यन्तेऽत्र संस्क्रियन्ते तस्मादेनामन्वोत्सृजति । इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्यैन्द्राग्न्या[5] ऊरू उर्वष्ठीवे[6] प्रतिष्ठे । ताः षट्पदा भवन्ति प्रतिष्ठाया एव द्विप्रतिष्ठो वै पुरुषश्चतुष्पादाः[7] पशवो यजमानमेव तद्द्विप्रतिष्ठं चतुष्पात्सु पशुषु प्रतिष्ठापयति । द्वितीया सप्तपदा भवति तां गायत्रीं चानुष्टुभं च[8] करोति ब्रह्म वै गायत्री वागनुष्टुब्ब्रह्मणैव तद्वाचं संदधाति । त्रिष्टुभमन्ततः शंसति वीर्यं[9] वै त्रिष्टुब्वीर्येणैव तत्पशून्परिगच्छति तस्मात्पशवो वीर्यमनूपतिष्ठन्त ईर्यतां चैवाभ्युत्थानं च ॥१॥[10]

प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्धस[1] इत्यैन्द्रे निष्केवल्ये[2] निविदं[3] दधाति प्रत्यक्षाद्धेव[4] तदात्मन्वीर्यं धत्ते । तास्त्रिष्टुब्जगत्यो भवन्ति । तदाहुरथ कस्मात्त्रिष्टुब्जगतीषु निविदं दधातीति । न ह वा एतस्याहू एकं छन्दो निविदं दाधार न विव्याचेति तस्मात्त्रिष्टुब्जगतीषु निविदं दधाति । तदेतदहस्त्रिनिवित्कं विद्याद्वशो निविद्वालखिल्या[5] निविन्निविदेव निविदेवमेनत्त्रिनिवित्कं विद्यात् । अथ सूक्ते वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो

[5] ऐन्द्राग्ना F, G. [6] ऊर्व° R. [7] चतुष्पादः F, G. [8] om. G; चरोति L.
[9] वीर्यं A. [10] Numbered 20 in A, E, F, K, L; 20, 1 in G; 1 in D.
[1] मन्द्रना° L. [2] निष्कैवल्ये F, G. [3] निविद् A. [4] प्रत्यक्षाध्येव A, G, K.
[5] वालखिल्याम् G. [6] °मेन° A; °मनत् G; °मेतत् R in commentary; °मेव D, E.

ज्ञात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति तयोरत्यन्ते समस्य यदसन्म-नीषा इत्यन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै। अथावपनमेते अन्तरेणैन्द्रीणां दश-तीनां त्रिष्टुब्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपन्ते तावन्त्यू-र्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जीवन्त्येतेन हैवावपनेनायुराप्यते। प्रज्ञां मे पशवोऽजेयन्निति त्वेव सजनीयमनुशंसति। तार्क्ष्यं शंसति स्वस्त्ययनं वै तार्क्ष्यः स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्ययनमेव तत्कुरुते[8]। एकपदां शंसत्येकधेदं सर्वमसानीत्यथो सर्वा छन्दस्कृतिमाप्नवा-नीति। इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्निति पदानुषङ्गास्ताः सप्तानुषजति सप्त वै शीर्षन्प्राणाः शीर्षन्नेव[10] तत्प्राणान्दधात्यष्टमीं नानुषजति वागष्टमी नेन्मे वाक्प्राणैरनुषक्तासदिति तस्माद् सा वाक्समा-नायतना प्राणैः सत्यननुषक्ता। विराजः शंसत्यन्नं वै विराजो ऽन्नाद्यस्यावरुद्ध्यै। वासिष्ठेन परिदधाति वसिष्ठोऽसानीति। एष स्तोमो मह उग्राय वाह इति महद्वत्या रूपसमृद्धया। धुरी-वात्यो न वाजयन्नधायीत्यन्तो वै धूरन्त एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। इन्द्र त्वायमर्के ईट्टे वसूनामित्यर्कवत्या रूपसमृद्धया। दिवीव द्यामधि नः श्रोमतं[11] धा इति यत्र ह क्व च[12] ब्राह्मणा वागुद्यते तद्धास्य[13] कीर्तिर्भवति यश्चैवं विद्वानेतया परिदधाति तस्मादेवं विद्वानेतयैव परिदध्यात्॥२॥[14]

7 पशवोर्जेऽयम् R in text　8 कुर्ते F　9 शासत्य् R in text
10 शीर्षन्त्यि॰ F, G, शीर्षनेव L　11 म D, E श्री॰ R　12 क्ष च om E
13 तद्वास्य R, तस्यद्वा G तद्वस्य F　14 Numbered 21 in A, E G, K L.
21 2 in F 2 in D

तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरावैकाहिकौ रूपसमृद्धौ बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । तद्देवस्य सवितुर्वार्यं महदिति सावित्रमन्तो वै महदन्त एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। कतरा पूर्वा कतरापरायोरिति द्यावापृथिवीयं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। अनश्वो जातो अनभीशुरुक्थ्य इत्यार्भवम् । रथस्त्रिचक्र इति यदेतत्त्रिवत्तदन्तो वै त्रिवदन्त एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। अस्य[2] वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति वैश्वदेवं बहुरूपं बहुरूपं वा एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम् । गौरीर्मिमाय सलिलानि तक्षतीत्येतदन्तम् । आ नो भद्राः क्रतवो यन्तु विश्वत इति वैश्वदेवं निविद्धानमैकाहिकं रूपसमृद्धं बहु वा एतस्मिन्नहनि किञ्च किञ्च वारणं क्रियते शान्त्या एव शान्तिर्वै प्रतिष्ठैकाहःशान्त्यामेव तत्प्रतिष्ठायामन्ततः प्रतितिष्ठन्ति। प्रतितिष्ठति य एवं वेद येषां चैवं विद्वानेतद्धोता शंसति । वैश्वानराय धिषणामृतावृध इत्याग्निमारुतस्य प्रतिपदन्तो वै धिषणान्त एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। प्रयज्यवो मरुतो भ्राजदृष्टय इति मारुतं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपम्। जातवेदसे सुनवाम सोममिति जातवेदस्यां पुरस्तात्सूक्तस्य शंसति स्वस्त्ययनं वै जातवेदस्या[4] स्वस्तितायै स्वस्त्ययनमेव तत्कुरुते।

[1] पदे S. [2] एतस्यावमस्य omitting the rest, F. [3] धिदाम् A.
[4] जातवेदस्याः B in text.

इमं स्तोममर्हते जातवेदस इति जातवेदस्यं समानोदर्कं समानोदर्कं वा एतदहरेतस्याह्नो रूपमह्नो रूपम् ॥३॥[4]

॥ इत्यैतरेयप्रथमारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥[5]

॥ इति प्रथमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

[4] Numbered 22 in A, E, K, L, 22, 3 in F, G

[5] Text, A and, omitting the second इति, L, पचमोऽध्यायः ५ । इति प्रथमारण्यक समाप्त । F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः प्रथमारणः D, इति प्रथम आरण्ये पंचमोऽध्यायः ५ K, E continues after the number एष पन्था तत्कर्म । तत्सवितुर्वृणीमहेऽद्या नो देव सवितरिति । प्र वो महे मन्दमनायान्धस इति । वश्च शसति । गायत्री तृचाशीति शसति । अथातो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अथ सूददोहाः । ता नदेम विहरति प्राणो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यते यद्वै ज्येष्ठम् । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । तदाहुः कितस्याह्नः प्रतिपदिति । हिकारेणैतदेह प्रतिपद्येतेत्याहुः । अरत्निमात्र उपरि भूमेः प्रेङ्खः स्यादित्याहुः । तदाहुः किं प्रेङ्खस्य[a] प्रेङ्खत्वमिति । असत्सु मे जरितस्साभिवेगस्त्यधृतमिति शसति । आ त्वा रथ यथोतय इद[d] वसो सुतमन्ध इति[d] । वायवा याहि दर्शतेमे[e] सोमा अरङ्कृता इति[e] । गायत्र प्रउग कुर्यादित्याहुः । अभि भरो दीधितिगिरस्योरित्यन्नाद्यकाम. । अथ महाव्रतम् । अथ महाव्रत चत्वारि । आ त्वा रथ चत्वारि । हिकारेणाष्टौ । अथ सूददोहास्त्रयः । वशस्त्रयः । अथ महाव्रत तदिति प्र वो महे द्वौ । इति[g] प्रथमारण्यम् । This appears also in F and G with the variants noted below but not in the other MSS It forms of course, a sort of Anukramaṇī of the contents and E has similar notices at the end of each Āraṇyaka

[a] Before this, F, G have ता नदेम विहरति पुरुषो वै नदः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठमिति प्रतिपद्यत एतदाव भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठ । तदिति प्रतिपद्यते । These three were obviously omitted accidentally through the identity of three and six [b] हिकारेणैव तदह F, G [c] om F. [d] इद—इति om F, G [e] इमे—इति om F, G [f] वश्च G, वशस्त्रयः om F [g] om. F, G

## ॥ अथ द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

### Adhyāya 1.

एष पन्था एतत्कर्मैतद्ब्रह्मैतत्सत्यम्। तस्मान्न प्रमाद्येत्तन्नातीयात्। न ह्यत्यायन्पूर्वे येऽत्यायंस्ते पराबभूवुः। तदुक्तमृषिणा। प्रजा ह तिस्रो अत्यायमीयुर्न्यन्या अर्कमभितो विविश्र। बृहद्ध तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तः पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति॥ प्रजा ह तिस्रो[1] अत्यायमीयुरिति या वै ता इमाः प्रजास्तिस्रो[1] अत्यायमायंस्तानीमानि वयांसि वङ्गावगधाश्चेरपादाः न्यन्या अर्कमभितो विविश्र इति ता इमाः प्रजा अर्कमभितो निविष्टा इममेवाग्निम्। बृहद्ध तस्थौ भुवनेष्वन्तरित्यद[2] उ एव बृहद्भुवनेष्वन्तरसावादित्यः। पवमानो हरित आ विवेशेति वायुरेव पवमानो दिशो[3] हरित आविष्टः[4] ॥१॥

उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति तदिदमेवोक्थमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च। तस्याग्निरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते। अन्तरिक्षमेवोक्थमन्तरिक्षं वा अनु पतन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु धावयन्ति तस्य वायुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते। असावेव द्यौरुक्थममुतः प्रदानाद्धीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च तस्यासावादित्योऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयो

[1] तिस्रः here and below R in text, but the words are clearly quoted in their Ṛgvedic form [2] ष्वतर् A [3] दिशे R in text [4] आविष्टाः F

ऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुष एवोक्थमयमेव महान्प्रजापतिरहमुक्थमस्मीति विद्यात् । तस्य मुखमेवोक्थं यथा पृथिवी तथा । तस्य वागर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । नासिके एवोक्थं यथान्तरिक्षं तथा । तस्य प्राणोऽर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । तदेतद्भ्रूभस्य[1] विष्टपं यदेतन्नासिकायै विनतमिव । ललाटमेवोक्थं यथा द्यौस्तथा । तस्य चक्षुरर्कोऽन्नमशीतयोऽन्नेन हीदं सर्वमश्नुते । समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेवान्नेन हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि समनन्ती३ अन्नेनेमं लोकं जयत्यन्नेनामुं तस्मात्समानमशीतयोऽध्यात्मं चाधिदैवतं चान्नमेव । तदिदमन्नमन्नादमियमेव पृथिवीतो हीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति यदिदं किञ्च । यद्ध किञ्चेदं प्रेता३इ तदसौ सर्वमत्ति यदु किञ्चातः प्रेती३ तदियं सर्वमत्ति सेयमित्याद्यात्त्री । अत्ता ह वा आद्यो भवति । न तस्येशे यन्नाद्याद्यद्वैनं नाद्युः ॥२॥

अथातो रेतसः सृष्टिः । प्रजापते रेतो देवा देवानां रेतो वर्षं वर्षस्य रेत ओषधय ओषधीनां रेतोऽन्नमन्नस्य रेतो रेतो रेतसो रेतः प्रजाः प्रजानां रेतो हृदयं हृदयस्य रेतो मनो मनसो रेतो वाग्वाचो रेतः कर्म तदिदं कर्म कृतमयं पुरुषो ब्रह्मणो लोकः । स इरामयो यद्धीरामयस्तस्माद्धिरण्मयः । हिरण्मयो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवति हिरण्मयः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद ॥३॥

[1] ब्रह्मस्य G [2] यजत्य॰ G

[1] कर्मकृत॰ II

तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत[1] ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं यत्प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत ब्रह्मेमं पुरुषं तस्मात्प्रपदे तस्मात्प्रपदे इत्याचक्षते शफाः खुरा इत्यन्येषां पशूनाम् । तदूर्ध्वमुदसर्पत्ता ऊरू अभवताम् । उरु गृणीहीत्यब्रवीत्तदुदरमभवत् । उर्वेव मे कुर्वित्यब्रवीत्तदुरोऽभवत् । उदरं ब्रह्मेति शार्कराक्ष्या[2] उपासते हृदयं ब्रह्मेत्यारुणयो ब्रह्मा-हैव ता३इ[3] । ऊर्ध्वं त्वेवोदसर्पत्तच्छिरोऽश्रयत यच्छिरोऽश्रयत तच्छिरोऽभवत्तच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वम् । ता एताः शीर्षञ्छ्रियः श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणः । श्रयन्तेऽस्मिञ्छ्रियो य एवमेतच्छिरसः शिरस्त्वं वेद । ता अहिंसन्ताहमुक्थमस्म्यहमु-क्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तास्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रामाम तद्यस्मिन्न उत्क्रान्त इदं शरीरं पत्स्यति तदुक्थं[4] भविष्यतीति । वागुदक्रा-मदवदन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । चक्षुरुदक्रामदपश्यन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । श्रोत्रमुदक्रामदशृण्वन्नश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । मन उदक्रामन्मीलित इवाश्नन्पिबन्नास्तैव । प्राण उदक्रामत्तत्प्राण उत्क्रान्ते[5]ऽपद्यत । तदशीर्यताशारीती[6]३ तच्छरीरमभवत्तच्छरीरस्य शरीरत्वम् । शीर्यते ह वा अस्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यः परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । ता अहिंसन्तैवाहमुक्थमस्म्यहमु-क्थमस्मीति । ता अब्रुवन्हन्तेदं पुनः शरीरं प्रविशाम तद्यस्मिन्नः प्रपन्न इदं शरीरमुत्थास्यति तदुक्थं भविष्यतीति । वाक्प्राविश-दशयदेव । चक्षुः प्राविशदशयदेव । श्रोत्रं[7] प्राविशदशयदेव ।

[1] मापद्यतं G [2] शार्क° G [3] ब्रह्मा हैव R, cp p 68, J R A.S, 1908, p 366 [4] यत् G, त om K. [5] उत्क्रान्ते R in text. [6] तशी° E
[7] This clause is omitted in G.

मनः प्राविशद्शयदेव। प्राणः प्राविशत्तत्प्राणे प्रपन्न उदतिष्ठत्तदुक्थमभवत्। तदेतदुंक्थाँ३ प्राण एव। प्राण उक्थमित्येव विद्यात्। तं देवा अब्रुवंस्त्वमुक्थमसि त्वमिदं सर्वमसि तव वयं स्मस्त्वमस्माकमसीति। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। त्वमस्माकं तव स्मसीति ॥४॥

तं देवाः प्राणयन्त स प्रणीतः प्रातायत प्रातायीती॑३ तत्प्रातरभवत्समागादिती॑३ तत्सायमभवदहरेव प्राणो रात्रिरपानः। वागग्निश्चक्षुरसावादित्यश्चन्द्रमा मनो दिशः श्रोत्रं स एष प्रहितां संयोगोऽध्यात्ममिमा देवता अद उ आविरधिदैवतमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति। एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह हिरण्यदन्वैदो न तस्येशे यन्मह्यं न दद्युरिति प्रहितां वा अहमध्यात्मं संयोगं निविष्टं वेदैतद्ध तत्। अनीशानानि ह वा अस्मै भूतानि बलिं हरन्ति य एवं वेद। तत्सत्यं सदिति प्राणस्तीत्यन्नं[2] यमित्यसावादित्यस्तदेतत्त्रिवृत्त्रिवृदिव वै चक्षुः शुक्लं कृष्णं कनीनिकेति। स यदि ह वा अपि मृषा वदति सत्यं हैवास्योदितं भवति य एवमेतत्सत्यस्य सत्यत्वं वेद ॥५॥

तस्य वाक्तन्तिर्नामानि दामानि[1] तदस्येदं वाचा तन्त्या नामभिर्दामभिः सर्वं सितं सर्वं हीदं नामनी॑३ सर्वं वाचाभि-

[6] तक्थं A; उक्थं E, F, उक्थं३ G.

[1] यं R, S, with the MSS. See explanatory note. [2] तीत्यमयम् G, तीत्यन्नयंम D, E [3] मम् K

[1] दमानि G

वदति। वहन्ति ह वा एनं तन्तिसंबद्धा य एवं वेद। तस्योष्णिग्लोमानि त्वग्गायत्री[2] त्रिष्टुम्मांसमनुष्टुप्स्नावान्यस्थि जगती पङ्क्तिर्मज्जा प्राणो बृहती स छन्दोभिश्छन्नो[3] यच्छन्दोभिश्छन्नस्तस्माच्छन्दांसीत्याचक्षते। छादयन्ति ह वा एनं छन्दांसि पापात्कर्मणो यस्यां कस्यांचिद्दिशि कामयते य एवमेतच्छन्दसां छन्दस्त्वं वेद। तदुक्तमृषिणा। अपश्यं गोपामित्येष वै गोपा एष हीदं सर्वं गोपायति। अनिपद्यमानमिति न ह्येष कदाचन संविशति। आ च परा च पथिभिश्चरन्तमित्या च ह्येष परा च पथिभिश्चरति। स सध्रीचीः स विषूचीर्वसान इति सध्रीचीश्च ह्येष विषूचीश्च वस्त इमा एव दिशः। आ वरीवर्त्ति भुवनेष्वन्तरित्येष ह्यन्तर्भुवनेष्वावरीवर्त्ति। अथो आवृतासोऽवतासो न कर्तृभिरिति। सर्वं हीदं प्राणेनावृतम्। सोऽयमाकाशः प्राणेन[4] बृहत्या विष्टब्धस्तद्यथायमाकाशः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्ध[5] एवं सर्वाणि भूतान्यापिपीलिकाभ्यः प्राणेन बृहत्या विष्टब्धानीत्येवं[6] विद्यात्॥६॥

अथातो त्रिभृतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य। तस्य वाचा सृष्टौ पृथिवी चाग्निश्चास्यामोषधयो जायन्तेऽग्निरेनाः स्वदयतीदमाहरतेदं[1]माहरतेत्येवमेतौ वाचं पितरं परिचरतः पृथिवी चाग्निश्च। यावदं[2]नु पृथिवी यावदन्वग्निस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते पृथिव्याश्चाग्नेश्च य एवमेतां वाचो

[2] गायत्रीउम् F. [3] छन्नो A. [4] प्राणो न R in text. [5] ष्टब्ध A. [6] ०वं R.
[1] एदमाहरते *bis* F, G. [2] यावदनु पृथिवी *bis* F.

विभूतिं वेद। प्राणेन सृष्टावन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्चान्तरिक्षं वा अनु चरन्त्यन्तरिक्षमनु शृण्वन्ति वायुरस्मै पुण्यं गन्धमावहत्येवमेतौ प्राणं पितरं परिचरतोऽन्तरिक्षं च वायुश्च। यावदन्वन्तरिक्षं यावदनु वायुस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते[3]ऽन्तरिक्षस्य च वायोश्च य एवमेतां प्राणस्य विभूतिं वेद। चक्षुषा सृष्टौ द्यौश्चादित्यश्च द्यौर्हास्मै वृष्टिमन्नाद्यं संप्रयच्छत्यादित्योऽस्य ज्योतिः प्रकाशं करोत्येवमेतौ चक्षुः पितरं परिचरतो द्यौश्चादित्यश्च। यावदनु द्यौर्यावदन्वादित्यस्तावानस्य लोको भवति[4] नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतयोर्न जीर्यते दिवश्चादित्यस्य च य एवमेतां चक्षुषो विभूतिं वेद। श्रोत्रेण सृष्टा दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च दिग्भ्यो हैनमार्यन्तीँ३[5] दिग्भ्यो विशृणोति चन्द्रमा अस्मै पूर्वपक्षापरपक्षान्विचिनोति पुण्याय कर्मण एवमेते श्रोत्रं पितरं परिचरन्ति दिशश्च चन्द्रमाश्च। यावदनु दिशो यावदनु चन्द्रमास्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यते दिशां च चन्द्रमसश्च य[6] एवमेतां श्रोत्रस्य विभूतिं वेद। मनसा सृष्टा आपश्च[6] वरुणश्चापो हास्मै श्रद्धां संनमन्ते पुण्याय कर्मणे वरुणोऽस्य प्रजां धर्मेण दाधारैवमेते मनः पितरं परिचरन्त्यापश्च वरुणश्च। यावदन्वापो यावदनु वरुणस्तावानस्य लोको भवति नास्य तावल्लोको जीर्यते यावदेतेषां न जीर्यतेऽपां च वरुणस्य च य एवमेतां मनसो विभूतिं वेद ॥७॥

[3] ॰यते G [4] भवति लोको om. G [5] आर्तीँ३ G
[6] य — आपश्च om. F, G.

[आपा३ इत्याप[1] इति तदिदमाप एवेदं वै मूलमदस्तूलमयं पितैते पुत्रा यत्र ह क्व च पुत्रस्य तत्पितुर्यत्र वा पितुस्तद्वा पुत्रस्येत्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वानाह महिदास ऐतरेय आहं[2] मां देवेभ्यो वेद ओ मद्देवान्वेदेत:प्रदाना ह्येत इतः संभृता इति] [स एष गिरिश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक्प्राणस्तं ब्रह्म-गिरिरित्याचक्षते । गिरति[3] ह वै द्विषन्तं पाप्मानं भ्रातृव्यं परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एषोऽसुः स[4] एष प्राणः स एष भूतिश्चाभूतिश्च] तं भूतिरिति देवा उपासांचक्रिरे ते बभूवुस्तस्माद्वाप्येतर्हि सुप्तो भूर्भूरित्येव प्रश्व-सिति । अभूतिरित्यसुरास्ते ह पराबभूवुः । भवत्यात्मना परास्य द्विषन्पाप्मा भ्रातृव्यो भवति य एवं वेद । स एष मृत्युश्चैवामृतं
४ च [तदुक्तमृषिणा । अपाङ्प्राङेति स्वधया गृभीत इत्यपानेन ह्ययं यतः प्राणो[5] न पराङ्भवति । अमर्त्यो मर्त्येना[6] सयोनि-रित्येतेन हीदं सर्वं सयोनि मर्त्यानि हीमानि शरीराणी३-अमृतैषा देवता । ता शश्वन्ता विषूचीना वियन्ता न्यन्यं चि-क्युर्न नि चिक्युरन्यमिति निचिन्वन्ति हैवेमानि शरीराणी३ अमृतैवैषा देवता] अमृतो ह वा अमुष्मिँल्लोके संभवत्यमृतः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यो ददृशे य एवं वेद य एवं वेद ॥८॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[8]

[1] अप A; at the beginning आपा३: R. [2] आह E. [3] गिरिति D, G.
[4] स एष प्राणः om. F. [5] प्राणेन F. [6] मर्त्यना D. [7] चिक्युः G, omitting चि. [8] Text, L, R, इति ऐतरेयारण्यके द्वितीयस्य प्रथमोऽध्यायः A,

## ADHYĀYA 2.

एष इमं लोकमभ्यार्चत्पुरुषरूपेण य एष तपति प्राणो वाव[1] तदभ्यार्चत्प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति। तं शतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत्तस्माच्छतं वर्षाणि पुरुषायुषो भवन्ति तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत्तस्माच्छतर्चिनस्तस्माच्छतर्चिन इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं मध्यतो दधे यदिदं किञ्च तस्मान्[2]माध्यमास्तस्मान्माध्यमा[3] इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। प्राणो वै गृत्सोऽपानो मदः स यत्प्राणो[4] गृत्सोऽपानो मदस्तस्माद्गृत्समदस्तस्माद्गृत्समद इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। तस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्[5]यदिदं किञ्च तद्यदस्येदं विश्वं मित्रमासीद्यदिदं किञ्च[6] तस्माद्विश्वामित्रस्तस्माद्विश्वामित्र इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वाम इति तस्माद्वाम[7]देवस्तस्माद्वामदेव इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। स इदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽत्रायत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वं पाप्मनोऽत्रायत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मादत्रयस्तस्मादत्रय इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् ॥१॥[8]

इति द्वितीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, द्वितीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः १ F, G, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D.

[1] वावद् F [2] तस्मान्माध्यमास् om. F, मध्यमास् E [3] मध्यमा E, as in Bṛhaddevatā III, 116 [4] प्राणे वै F, प्राणो वै गृत्सो वै गृत्सो G [5] असीद् E [6] तद् — किञ्च om. F. [7] तस्माद्वामदेवस् om. F

[8] Numbered 9 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, 1 in D

एष उ एव बिभ्रद्वाजः प्रजा वै वाजस्ता[1] एष बिभर्ति यद्बिभर्ति तस्माद्भरद्वाजस्तस्माद्भरद्वाज इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । तं देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तं यद्देवा अब्रुवन्नयं वै नः सर्वेषां वसिष्ठ इति तस्माद्वसिष्ठस्तस्माद्वसिष्ठ इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभिप्रागाद्यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्प्रगाथास्तस्मात्प्रगाथा[3] इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । स इदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च स यदिदं सर्वमभ्यपवयत यदिदं किञ्च तस्मात्पावमान्यस्तस्मात्पावमान्य इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । सोऽब्रवीदहमिदं सर्वमसानि यच्च क्षुद्रं यच्च महदिति ते क्षुद्रसूक्ताश्चाभवन्महासूक्ताश्च तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्तास्तस्मात्क्षुद्रसूक्ता इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । सूक्तं बतावोचतेति तत्सूक्तमभवत्तस्मात्सूक्तं तस्मात्सूक्तमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा ऋगेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादृक्तस्मादृगित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा अर्धर्च एष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्योऽर्धेभ्योऽर्चत तस्मादर्धर्चस्तस्मादर्धर्च इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वै पदमेष हीमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि स यदिमानि सर्वाणि भूतानि पादि तस्मात्पदं तस्मात्पदमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम् । एष वा अक्षरमेष ह्येभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति

[1] तं R in text. [2] प्रागाथाः A, D, E, K. [3] प्रागाथाः D, E, K pr. man. Both Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 3, and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 10, 3, have प्र°.

स यदेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो भूतेभ्यः क्षरति न चैनमतिक्षरन्ति तस्मादक्षरं तस्मादक्षरमित्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्। ता वा एताः सर्वा ऋचः सर्वे वेदाः सर्वे घोषा एकैव व्याहृतिः प्राण एव प्राण ऋच इत्येव विद्यात्॥२॥[4]

विश्वामित्रं ह्येतदहः शंसिष्यन्तमिन्द्र उपनिषसाद[1]। स हान्नमित्यभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे द्वितीयं शंसेति। स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं[2] शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागाः स वा ऋषे तृतीयं शंसेति। स हान्नमित्येवाभिव्याहृत्य बृहतीसहस्रं शशंस तेनेन्द्रस्य प्रियं धामोपेयाय। तमिन्द्र उवाच ऋषे प्रियं वै मे धामोपागा वरं ते ददामीति। स होवाच त्वामेव जानीयामिति। तमिन्द्र उवाच प्राणो वा अहमस्म्यृषे प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति स एतेन[3] रूपेण सर्वा दिशो विष्टोऽस्मि तस्य मेऽन्नं मित्रं दक्षिणं तद्वैश्वामित्रमेष तपन्नेवास्मीति होवाच॥३॥[5]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि तच्छरीरं यो घोषः स आत्मा य ऊष्माणः स प्राणः। एतद्ध स्म

[4] Numbered 10 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L; 2 in D.

[1] उपनिषसाद all MSS. R, S    [2] बृहतीसहतीसहस्रं E    [3] एतेन F
[4] तद्वै विश्वामित्रम् D    [5] Numbered 11 in A, E, G, H, K, L, 1 in F, 3 in D

वै तद्विद्वान्वसिष्ठो वसिष्ठो बभूव तत एतन्नामधेयं लेभे। एतदु हैवेन्द्रो विश्वामित्राय प्रोवाचैतदु हैवेन्द्रो भरद्वाजाय प्रोवाच तस्मात्स तेन बन्धुना यज्ञेषु हूयते। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्षराणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति शतसंवत्सरस्याह्नां सहस्राणि भवन्ति व्यञ्जनैरेव रात्रीराप्नुवन्ति स्वरैरहानि। तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य परस्तात्प्रज्ञाममयो देवतामयो ब्रह्ममयोऽमृतमयः संभूय देवता अप्येति य[2] एवं वेद। तद्योऽहं सोऽसौ योऽसौ सोऽहम्। तदुक्तमृषिणा। सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्चेति[3]। एतदु हैवोपेक्षेतोपेक्षेत ॥४॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

## ADHYĀYA 3.

यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्थं वेद यस्मादिदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठति स संप्रतिवित्। पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतींषीत्येष वा आत्मोक्थं पञ्चविधमेतस्माद्धीदं सर्वमुत्तिष्ठत्येतमेवाप्येति। अयनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं[1] वेद।

[1] एनन् A; एतं R in text, no doubt a mistake due to the MSS as often putting *m* for an assimilated *n* before a nasal. Cf. II, 1, 5, यं for यन्. [2] य om. F. [3] स G. [4] Divided च। इति in R. [5] Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L; 12, 4 in F, G; 4 in D. [6] Text, A, L, R; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः२ K; द्वितीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः२ F, G; इति द्वितीयोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

[1] एवं om. A.

तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्यस्यान्नम्। आपश्च पृथिवी चान्नमेतन्मयानि ह्यन्नानि भवन्ति ज्योतिश्च वायुश्चान्नादमेताभ्यां हीदं सर्वमन्नमत्त्यावपनमाकाश आकाशे हीदं सर्वं समोप्यते। आवपनं ह वै समानानां भवति य एवं वेद। तस्मिन्योऽन्नं चान्नादं च वेदाहास्मिन्नन्नादो जायते भवत्यस्यान्नम्। ओषधिवनस्पतयोऽन्नं प्राणभृतोऽन्नादमोषधिवनस्पतीन्हि प्राणभृतोऽदन्ति। तेषां य उभयतोदन्ताः पुरुषस्यानुविधां[3] विहितास्तेऽन्नादा अन्नमितरे पशवस्तस्मात्त इतरान्पशूनधीव चरन्त्यधीव ह्यन्नेऽन्नादो भवति। अधीव ह समानानां जायते य एवं वेद ॥१॥[5]

[1] तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेदाश्नुते हाविर्भूयः। ओषधिवनस्पतयो यच्च किञ्च प्राणभृत्स आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद। ओषधिवनस्पतिषु हि रसो दृश्यते चित्तं प्राणभृत्सु। प्राणभृत्सु त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा तेषु हि रसोऽपि दृश्यते न चित्तमितरेषु। पुरुषे त्वेवाविस्तरामात्मा स हि प्रज्ञानेन संपन्नतमो विज्ञातं वदति विज्ञातं पश्यति वेद श्वस्तनं वेद लोकालोकौ मर्त्येनामृतमीप्सत्येवं संपन्नः। अथेतरेषां पशूनामशनापिपासे एवाभिविज्ञानं न विज्ञातं वदन्ति न विज्ञातं पश्यन्ति न विदुः श्वस्तनं न लोकालोकौ त एतावन्तो भवन्ति यथाप्रज्ञं[2] हि संभवाः ॥२॥[3]

[2] °त्य° R [3] अनुविधा S [4] इतरान् F. [5] Numbered 13 in A, E, H, K, L, 13, 5 in F, G, 1 in D

[1] आप्नुतस्य G [2] प्रज्ञा F [3] Numbered 14 in A, E, H, K, L, 14, 2 in F, G, 2 in D

स एष पुरुषः समुद्रः सर्वं लोकमति। यद्ध किञ्चाश्नुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते[1] यद्यन्तरिक्षलोकमश्नुतेऽत्येनं मन्यते यद्यमुं लोकमश्नुवीतात्येवैनं मन्येत। स एष पुरुषः पञ्चविधस्तस्य यदुष्णं तज्ज्योतिर्यानि खानि स आकाशोऽथ यल्लोहितं श्लेष्मा[2] रेतस्ता आपो यच्छरीरं सा पृथिवी यः प्राणः स[3] वायुः। स एष वायुः पञ्चविधः प्राणोऽपानो व्यान उदानः समानः[4]। ता एता[5] देवताः प्राणापानयोरेव निविष्टाश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वागिति प्राणस्य ह्यन्वपायमेता अपियन्ति। स एष वाचश्चित्तस्योत्तरोत्तरिक्रमो यद्यज्ञः। स एष यज्ञः पञ्चविधोऽग्निहोत्रं दर्शपूर्णमासौ चातुर्मास्यानि पशुः सोमः। स एष यज्ञानां संपन्नतमो यत्सोम एतस्मिन्ह्येताः पञ्चविधा अधिगम्यन्ते यत्प्राक्सवनेभ्यः सैकाविधा त्रीणि सवनानि यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी ॥३॥[6]

यो ह वै यज्ञे यज्ञं वेदाहन्यहर्देवेषु देवमध्यूळ्हं स संप्रतिवित्। एष वै यज्ञे यज्ञोऽहन्यहर्देवेषु[1] देवोऽध्यूळ्हो यदेतन्महदुक्थम्। तदेतत्पञ्चविधं त्रिवृत्पञ्चदशं सप्तदशमे[2]कविंशं पञ्चविंशमिति स्तोमतो गायत्रं रथन्तरं बृहद्भद्रं राजनमिति सामतो गायत्र्युष्णिग्बृहती त्रिष्टुब्द्विपदेति छन्दस्तः शिरो दक्षिणः पक्ष उत्तरः पक्षः पुच्छमात्मेत्याख्यानम्। पञ्चकृत्वः प्रस्तौति पञ्चकृत्व उद्गायति पञ्चकृत्वः प्रतिहरति पञ्चकृत्व उपद्रवति पञ्चकृत्वो निध-

[1] यमद्य° F. [2] श्लोष्मा A, F. [3] स वायुः *bis* F. [4] समानः *bis* F.
[5] पशवे inserted in G; देवताः om. F. [6] Numbered 15 in A, E, H, K, L; 15, 3 in F, G; 3 in D.

[1] देवं — देवेषु om. F, G. [2] सप्तदम् E.

नमुपयन्ति तत्स्तोभसहस्रं भवति । एवं ह्येताः पञ्च विधा अनुशस्यन्ते यत्माकृचाशीतिभ्यः सैका विधा तिस्रसृचाशीतयो यदूर्ध्वं सा पञ्चमी । तदेतत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वं तानि दश[3] दशेति वै सर्वमेतावती हि संख्या दश दशतस्तच्छतं दशशतानि तत्सहस्रं तत्सर्वम् । तानि त्रीणि छन्दांसि भवन्ति त्रेधा विहितं वा इदमन्नमशनं पानं[4] खादस्तदेतैराप्नोति ॥४॥[5]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नम् । तद्धैतदेके नानाछन्दसां सहस्रं प्रतिजानते किमन्यत्सदन्यद्ब्रूयामेति । त्रिष्टुप्सहस्रमेके[1] जगतीसहस्रमेकेऽनुष्टुप्सहस्रमेके । तदुक्तमृषिणा । अनुष्टुभमनु चर्चूर्यमाणमिन्द्रं नि चिक्युः कवयो मनीषेति ॥ वाचि वै तदैन्द्रं प्राणं न्यचायन्नित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माहाकृत्स्नो ह्येष आत्मा यद्वागभि हि प्राणेन[2] मनसेऽस्यमानो वाचा नानुभवति । बृहतीमभिसंपादयेदेष वै कृत्स्न आत्मा यद्बृहती । सोऽयमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरैः परिवृतस्तद्यथायमात्मा सर्वतः शरीरैः परिवृत एवमेव बृहती सर्वतश्छन्दोभिः परिवृता । मध्यं ह्येषामङ्गानामात्मा मध्यं छन्दसां बृहती । स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोरीश्वरो ह तु पुरायुषः प्रैतोरिति ह स्माह कृत्स्नो ह्येष ह्यात्मा यद्बृहती तस्माद्बृहतीमेवाभिसंपादयेत् ॥५॥[3]

[3] दश om F. [4] पान om F. [5] Numbered 16 in A, E, H, K, L, 16, 4 in F, G, 4 in D

[1] एते E. [2] See explanatory notes [3] Numbered 17 in A, E, H, K, L, 17, 5 in F, G, 5 in D.

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं[1] संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्यैकादशानुष्टुभां शतानि भवन्ति पञ्चविंशतिश्चानुष्टुभ आत्तं वै भूयसा कनीयः । तदुक्तमृषिणा । वाचमष्टापदीमहमिति । अष्टौ हि चतुरक्षराणि भवन्ति । नवस्रक्तिमिति बृहती संपद्यमाना नवस्रक्तिः[2] । ऋतस्पृशमिति सत्यं वै वागृचा स्पृष्टा । इन्द्रात्परि तन्वं ममे इति तद्यदेवैतद्बृहतीसहस्रमनुष्टुप्संपन्नं भवति तस्मात्तदैन्द्रात्प्राणाद्बृहत्यै वाचमनुष्टुभं तन्वं संनिर्मिमीते । स वा एष वाचः परमो[3] विकारो यदेतन्महदुक्थं तदेतत्पञ्चविधं मितममितं स्वरः सत्यानृते इति । ऋग्गाथा कुम्ब्या तन्मितं यजुर्निगदो वृथावाक्तदमितं सामाथो[4] यः कश्च गेष्णः सः स्वर ओ३मिति सत्यं नेत्यनृतम् । तदेतत्पुष्पं फलं वाचो यत्सत्यं स हेश्वरो यशस्वी कल्याणकीर्तिर्भवितोः पुष्पं हि फलं वाचः सत्यं वदति । अथैतन्मूलं वाचो यदनृतं तद्यथा वृक्ष आविर्मूलः शुष्यति स उद्वर्तत एवमेवानृतं वदन्नाविर्मूलमात्मानं करोति स शुष्यति स उद्वर्तते । तस्मादनृतं न वदेद्दयेत त्वेनेन । पराग्वा एतद्रिक्तमक्षरं यदेतदो३मिति तद्यत्किञ्चोमित्याहात्रैवास्मै तद्रिच्यते स यत्सर्वमोां कुर्याद्रिञ्च्यादात्मानं स कामेभ्यो नालं स्यात् । अथैतत्पूर्णमभ्यात्मं यन्नेति । स यत्सर्वं नेति ब्रूयात्पापिकास्य कीर्तिर्जायेत सैनं[5] तत्रैव हन्यात् । तस्मात्काल एव दद्यात्काले न दद्यात्तत्सत्यानृते मिथुनीकरोति तयोर्मिथुनात्प्रजायते भूयान्भवति । यो वै तां वाचं वेद यस्या एष विकारः स संप्रतिवित् ।

[1] बृहतीसहतीसहस्र F

[2] So I read for नवस्रक्ति of the MSS and edd See explanatory notes

[3] पमो A

[4] समाथो F, G

[5] सैन F

अकारो वै सर्वा वाक्सैषा स्पर्शोष्मभिर्व्यज्यमाना बह्वी नानारूपा भवति । तस्यै यदुपांशु स प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं तस्मात्तिर इव तिर इव ह्यशरीरमशरीरो हि प्राणोऽथ यदुच्चैस्तच्छरीरं[1] तस्मात्तदाविराविर्हि शरीरम् ॥६॥[1]

तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशः स इन्द्रः स भूतानामधिपतिः । स य एवमेतमिन्द्रं भूतानामधिपतिं वेद विस्रसा हैवास्माल्लोकात्प्रैतीति ह स्माह महिदास ऐतरेयः प्रेत्येन्द्रो भूत्वैषु लोकेषु राजति । तदाहुर्यदनेन रूपेणामुं लोकमभिसंभवती३ँ अथ केन रूपेणेमं लोकमाभवती३ँ । तद्यदेतत्स्त्रियां लोहितं भवत्यग्नेस्तद्रूपं तस्मात्तस्मान्न बीभत्सेताथ यदेतत्पुरुषे रेतो भवत्यादित्यस्य तद्रूपं तस्मात्तस्मान्न बीभत्सेत । सोऽयमात्मेममात्मानममुष्मा आत्मने संप्रयच्छत्यसावात्मामुमात्मानमिमस्मा[2] आत्मने संप्रयच्छति तावन्योन्यमभिसंभवतोऽनेनाह रूपेणामुं लोकमभिसंभवत्यमुनो रूपेणेमं लोकमाभवति ॥७॥[3]

तदेते श्लोकाः ।

यदक्षरं पञ्चविधं समेति । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति ।
सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यत्र युज्यते । तत्र देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥१॥

[1] तस्मात्—तच्छरीरम् bis G   [1] Numbered 18 in A, E, H, K, L, 18 7 in F, G, 5 in D

[1] om. G   [2] ॰मिममस्मै $S^{12}$ in text, $S^{145}$ in commentary   [3] Numbered 19 in A, E, H, K, L, 19 7 in F, G; 7 in D

यदक्षरादक्षरमेति युक्तम् । युजो युक्ता अभि यत्संवहन्ति । सत्यस्य सत्यमनु यत्र युज्यते । तत्र देवाः सर्व एकं भवन्ति ॥२॥

यद्वाच ओमिति यच्च नेति । यच्चास्याः क्रूरं यद्[1] चोल्बणिष्णु । तद्विधूया कवयो अन्वविन्दन् । नामामत्ता समतृणञ्छ्रुतेऽधि[2] ॥३॥

यस्मिन्नामा समतृणञ्छ्रुतेऽधि[3] । तत्र देवाः सर्वयुजो भवन्ति । तेन पाप्मानमपहत्य ब्रह्मणा । स्वर्गं लोकमप्येति विद्वान् ॥४॥

नैनं वाचा स्त्रियं ब्रुवन् । नैनमस्त्रीपुमान्ब्रुवन् । पुमांसं न ब्रुवन्नेनम् । वदन्वदति कश्चन ॥५॥

अ[4] इति ब्रह्म तत्रागतमहमिति । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य बृहतीसहस्रस्य संपन्नस्य षट्त्रिंशतमक्षराणां सहस्राणि भवन्ति तावन्ति पुरुषायुषोऽह्नां सहस्राणि भवन्ति । जीवाक्षरेणैव जीवाहराप्नोति जीवाह्ना जीवाक्षरमिति । अनकाममारोऽथ देवरथस्तस्य वागुद्धिः[5] श्रोत्रे पक्षसी चक्षुषी युक्ते मनः संग्रहीता तदयं प्राणोऽधितिष्ठति । तदुक्तमृषिणा । आ तेन यातं मनसो जवीयसा निमिषश्चिज्जवीयसेति जवीयसेति ॥८॥[6]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[7]

[1] यदि E. [2] ऽति F, G [3] ऽति F, G. [4] अह D, F, G; अः K, L, S. [5] वागुद्धि A, E, G. [6] Numbered 20 in A, E, H, K, L; 20, 8 in F, G; 8 in D. [7] Text, A, L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः F, G; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E.

## ADHYĀYA 4.

आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीन्नान्यत्किञ्चन मिषत् । स ईक्षत । लोकान्नु सृजा इति । स इमाँल्लोकानसृजत । अम्भो मरीचीर्मरमापः[1] । अदोऽम्भः परेण दिवं, द्यौः प्रतिष्ठान्तरिक्षं मरीचयः, पृथिवी मरो, या अधस्तात्ता आपः । स ईक्षतेमे नु लोका लोकपालान्नु सृजा इति । सोऽद्भ्य एव पुरुषं समुद्धृत्यामूर्छयत् । तमभ्यतपत्तस्याभितप्तस्य मुखं निरभिद्यत यथाण्डं मुखाद्वाग्वाचोऽग्निः । नसिके निरभिद्येतां नासिकाभ्यां प्राणः प्राणाद्वायुः । अक्षिणी निरभिद्येतामक्षीभ्यां[2] चक्षुश्चक्षुष आदित्यः । कर्णौ निरभिद्येतां कर्णाभ्यां श्रोत्रं श्रोत्राद्दिशः । त्वङ्निरभिद्यत त्वचो लोमानि लोमभ्य ओषधिवनस्पतयः । हृदयं निरभिद्यत[3] हृदयान्मनो मनसश्चन्द्रमाः । नाभिर्निरभिद्यत नाभ्या अपानोऽपानान्मृत्युः । शिश्नं निरभिद्यत शिश्नाद्रेतो रेतस आपः ॥१॥[4]

ता एता देवताः सृष्टा अस्मिन्महत्यर्णवे प्रापतंस्तमशनापिपासाभ्यामन्ववार्जत् । ता एनमब्रुवन्नायतनं नः प्रजानीहि[2] यस्मि-

[1] °मपः Böhtlingk [2] अक्षिभ्यां M, Roer and Rājarāma's edd [3] निरभिद्येत N, निरभिद्येतां corrected into निरभिद्यत M. [4] In the Upaniṣad, in the MSS and edd of text and Śaṅkara's commentary, in Rājārāma and Böhtlingk's edd, and differently in T, the Khaṇḍas are subdivided into paragraphs. Sāyaṇa's division of sentences is quite different, and as neither division has any authority the numbers are ignored S, T, Rājārāma's ed, and the MSS of Śaṅkara end. इति प्रथमः खण्डः । Numbered 21 in A, E, H, K, L; 21, 1 in F, G, 1 in D. The Upaniṣad MSS and edd. all prefix ओम्.

[1] अशनायापिपासे T, Rājārāma's ed here and below and in Jīvānanda's ed. (cited in U as (a) [2] प्रजानीहीति F.

न्प्रतिष्ठिता अन्नमदामेति । ताभ्यो गामानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्योऽश्वमानयत्ता अब्रुवन्न वै नोऽयमलमिति । ताभ्यः पुरुषमानयत्ता अब्रुवन्सुकृतं वतेति पुरुषो वाव सुकृतं । ता अब्रवीद्यथायतनं प्रविशतेति । अग्निर्वाग्भूत्वा मुखं प्राविशद्वायुः प्राणो भूत्वा नासिके प्राविशदादित्यश्चक्षुर्भूत्वाक्षिणी प्राविशद्दिशः श्रोत्रं भूत्वा कर्णौ प्राविशन्नोषधिवनस्पतयो लोमानि भूत्वा त्वचं[3] प्राविशंश्चन्द्रमा मनो भूत्वा[3] हृदयं प्राविशन्मृत्युरपानो भूत्वा नाभिं प्राविशदापो रेतो भूत्वा शिश्नं प्राविशन् । तमशनापिपासे अब्रूतामावाभ्यामभिप्रजानीहीति ते अब्रवीदेतास्वेव वां[5] देवतास्वाभजाम्येतासु भागिन्यौ करोमीति । तस्माद्यस्यै कस्यै च देवतायै हविर्गृह्यते भागिन्यावेवास्यामशनापिपासे भवतः ॥२॥[6]

स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्चान्नमेभ्यः सृजा इति । सोऽपो[1]ऽभ्यतपत्ताभ्योऽभितप्ताभ्यो मूर्तिरजायत । या वै सा मूर्तिरजायतान्नं वै तत् । तदेनत्सृष्टं[2] पराङत्य[3]जिगांसत्तद्वाचाजि-

[3] त्वचं — भूत्वा om A, added by Colebrooke with मनसो [4] °मधि T; °मपि Böhtlingk [5] वा N, Roer and Rājārāma's edd [6] Numbered 22 in A, E, H, K, L, 22, 2 in F, G, 2 in D; इति द्वितीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of Śaṅkara, in smaller print in Rājārāma's ed

[1] सोमो A. [2] तदेतदभिसृष्टं M, T, Jīvānanda's ed, तदन्नं U (one MS. ka). In Śaṅkara's comm, Jīvānanda's ed, and five MSS of U (ka, kha, ga, cha; ja) have °तत्. Three MSS. of U in Ānandatīrtha's ṭīkā here and two on p. 42, note 3, have °तत्. Rājārāma and Röer read तदेतदभिसृष्टं नदत्, and clearly this is what T had in view. The नदत् is not recognized in the commentaries, and seems a later addition to the text. Böhtlingk reads °देतत्. [3] So Böhtlingk for °घां° of MSS and edd.

गृह्क्षत्तन्नाशक्नोद्वाचा ग्रहीतुम्[4] । स यद्धैनद्वाचाग्रहैष्यदभिव्याहृत्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तत्प्राणेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोत्प्राणेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनत्प्राणेनाग्रहैष्यदभिप्राण्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तच्चक्षुषाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्चक्षुषा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनच्चक्षुषाग्रहैष्यद्दृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तच्छ्रोत्रेणाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्छ्रोत्रेण ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनच्छ्रोत्रेणाग्रहैष्यच्छ्रुत्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तत्त्वचाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोत्त्वचा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनत्त्वचाग्रहैष्यत्स्पृष्ट्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तन्मनसाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोन्मनसा ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनन्मनसाग्रहैष्यद्ध्यात्वा हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तच्छिश्नेनाजिघृक्षत्तन्नाशक्नोच्छिश्नेन ग्रहीतुम् । स यद्धैनच्छिश्नेनाग्रहैष्यद्विसृज्य हैवान्नमत्रप्स्यत् । तदपानेनाजिघृक्षत्तदावयत् । सैषो[7]ऽन्नस्य ग्रहो यद्वायुरन्नायुर्वा एष यद्वायुः । स ईक्षत कथं न्विदं मदृते स्यादिति । स ईक्षत कतरेण प्रपद्या इति । स ईक्षत यदि वाचाभिव्याहृतं यदि प्राणेनाभिप्राणितं यदि चक्षुषा दृष्टं यदि श्रोत्रेण श्रुतं यदि त्वचा स्पृष्टं यदि मनसा ध्यातं यद्यपानेनाभ्यपानितं यदि शिश्नेन विसृष्टमथ[8] कोऽहमिति । स एतमेव सीमानं विदार्यैतया द्वारा प्रापद्यत । सैषा विदृतिर्नाम द्वास्त-
5 देतन्नान्दनम् [तस्य त्रय आवसथास्त्रयः स्वप्ना] अयमावसथो
ऽयमावसथोऽयमावसथ इति । स जातो भूतान्यभिव्यैक्ष-
त्किमिहान्यं वावदिषदिति । स एतमेव पुरुषं ब्रह्म[11] ततमम-

[4] गृहीतुम् and so *infra* T Bohtlingk reads °ग्रहीष्यद् throughout [5] हैतच् T, Röer, Benares ed [6] जिघृक्षत्—शिश्नेन *bis* N. [7] स एषो T, Röer, Benares ed. [8] अथ T, om. Rājārāma. [9] विधृतिर् T. [10] वैक्षत् T, Röer, Bohtlingk; व्यख्यत् rest, विख्° Delbrück; वाव दिशेत् Böhtlingk [11] S prints as ब्रह्मततमम° against Saṅkara and Sāyaṇa

श्यत् । इदमदर्शमितीँ३[12] । तस्मादिदंद्रो नामेदंद्रो ह वै नाम तमिदंद्रं सन्तमिन्द्र[13] इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया[14] इव हि देवाः । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः ॥३॥[15]

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

ADHYĀYA 5

पुरुषे[1] ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । यदेतद्रेतस्तदेतत्सर्वेभ्यो ऽङ्गेभ्यस्तेजः संभूतमात्मन्येवात्मानं बिभर्ति तद्यदा स्त्रियां सिञ्चत्यथैनज्जनयति । तदस्य प्रथमं जन्म[7] । तत्स्त्रिया आत्मभूयं गच्छति यथा स्वमङ्गं तथा । तस्मादेनां न हिनस्ति । सास्यैतमात्मानमत्र गतं भावयति सा भावयित्री भावयितव्या भवति ।

[12] इति M Roer and Rajārama, °र्शा३म् Bohtlingk but cf II, 3, 7, &c [13] °न्द्रमित्य° Roer [14] पारोच F [15] Numbered 23 in A, E, F, H K, L, 23 3 in G, 3 in D इति तृतीयः खण्डः S, T, and MSS of Sañkara [16] So A, L R, द्वितीयारण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः F, G, इति चतुर्थोऽध्यायः D, इति श्री ऐतरेयोपनिषदि चतुर्थोऽध्याय समाप्तः ॥४॥ N, इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये चतुर्थ. M, no colophon E, इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके चतुर्थोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु प्रथमोऽध्याय. । श्री तत्सत् । T, इति द्वितीयारण्ये चतुर्थोऽध्यायः K Rājarāma follows T, correcting द्वितीये into °य

[1] Before पुरुषे, अपक्रामन्तु गर्भिण्यः is inserted in A, E, F, G, h, L N, R, S[4–9], U But though old the words cannot be original, and are not recognized by Sāyaṇa or Śaṅkara [2] रेतस् om A [3] तद्देतद् om J [4] सर्वेभ्यः J [5] सभृत T, Rājārāma's ed [6] °चैतज् T, Röer, Rājārāma and Jīvānanda's edd, and two MSS (ka, kha) cited in U, °चैतं Bohtlingk [7] इति प्रथमः खण्डः T. This must be due to a mistaken idea that the last colophon (see n 15) means that there are four khandas in this Adhyāya, whereas it really means that this is the fourth khanda of the whole Upanisad After भावयति it has ॥१॥ treating this as a new khanda

तं स्त्री गर्भं विभर्ति सोऽग्र[8] एव कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयति । स यत्कुमारं जन्मनोऽग्रेऽधिभावयत्यात्मानमेव तद्भावयति । एषां लोकानां संतत्या एवं संतता हीमे लोकाः । तदस्य द्वितीयं जन्म[10] । सोऽस्यायमात्मा पुण्येभ्यः कर्मभ्यः प्रतिधीयते[11] । अथास्यायमितर आत्मा कृतकृत्यो वयोगतः प्रैति । स इतः प्रयन्नेव पुनर्जायते । तदस्य तृतीयं जन्म । तदुक्तमृषिणा[12] । गर्भे नु सन्नन्वेषामवेदमहं देवानां जनिमानि विश्वा । शतं मा पुर आयसीररक्षन्नध श्येनो जवसा निरदीयमिति ॥ गर्भ एवैतच्छयानो वामदेव एवमुवाच[14] । स एवं विद्वानस्माच्छरीरभेदादूर्ध्व उत्क्रम्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्समभवत्[15] ।

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

[8] om Böhtlingk [9] तद् om N. [10] ॥२॥ इति द्वितीयः खण्डः T. [11] प्रतिनिधीयते T. This is an obvious error, and is borrowed from Śaṅkara's commentary. [12] ॥१॥ इति तृतीयः खण्डः T. [13] गर्भे नु सन्नु I, S has ॰न्नध: as have U, Röer, Benares, and Rājārāma's edd. [14] ॥१॥ T. [15] ॥२॥ T. T continues इति चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥४॥ and so S, U, and MSS of Śaṅkara Numbered 24 in A, C, H, K, L; 24, 1 in F, G, not numbered in D, numbered 14 in R. Before the number, A, S[4-9], Benares ed (*samvat* 1941), and U insert यथास्थानं तु (om. U) गर्भिन्यः. See on II, 6 The words are not recognized by Śaṅkara or Sāyaṇa, and cannot be genuine. [16] Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके पंचमोऽध्यायः A; इति द्वितीय आरण्यके पचमोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय आरण्ये पंचमोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके पंचमोऽध्यायः F, G; इति पञ्चमोऽध्यायः D; no colophon E; इति ऐतरीये पंचमः M; इत्यैतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके पञ्चमोऽध्यायः। उपनिषत्सु द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। ओं तत्सत् T; 4 only N. Rājārāma has इत्यैतरेयारण्यके and then as in T.

## Adhyāya 6

को[1]ऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे कतरः स आत्मा । येन वा[2] पश्यति येन वा[3] शृणोति येन वा गन्धानाजिघ्रति येन वा वाचं व्याकरोति येन वा स्वादु चास्वादु च विजानाति । यदेतद्धृदयं मनश्चैतत्संज्ञानमाज्ञानं विज्ञानं प्रज्ञानं मेधा[4] दृष्टि-र्धृतिर्मतिर्मनीषा जूतिः स्मृतिः संकल्पः क्रतुरसुः कामो वश इति । सर्वाण्येवैतानि प्रज्ञानस्य नामधेयानि भवन्ति । एष[6] ब्रह्मैष इन्द्र एष प्रजापतिरेते सर्वे देवा इमानि च पञ्च महा-भूतानि पृथिवी वायुराकाश आपो ज्योतींषीत्येतानीमानि च क्षुद्रमिश्राणीव बीजानीतराणि चेतराणि[7] चाण्डजानि[8] च जारुजानि[9] च स्वेदजानि चोद्भिज्जानि[10] चाश्वा गावः पुरुषा हस्तिनो यत्किञ्चेदं प्राणि जङ्गमं च पतत्रि च यच्च स्थावरं सर्वं तत्प्रज्ञानेत्रं[11] प्रज्ञाने प्रतिष्ठितं प्रज्ञानेत्रो[12] लोकः प्रज्ञा प्रतिष्ठा प्रज्ञानं[13] ब्रह्म । स एतेन[14] प्रज्ञेनात्मनास्माँल्लोकादुत्क्र-

[1] यथास्थानं तु गर्भिन्य is here inserted in R It is omitted by D E F G, H I L, N T, and in Sītārāma's text, and by Roer and Rajārāma See on II 5 यम॰ Max Muller and Bohtlingk [2] रूपं inserted in T in Roer, Jivananda and Rajārama's edd It is clearly borrowed from Saṅkara's commentary [3] शब्दान् inserted in T शब्द् in Roer Jivananda and Rajarama's edd [4] मेधा om I [6] दृतिर् F स्मृति om Benares ed [6] स added in T [7] बीजानित राणि I [8] चण्डजानि A [9] जानि only F जरायु॰ Bohtlingk [10] The spelling with two j s is supported by I M, T U, Rajārama and Sītārāma's edd against Benares ed, R and S [11] प्रज्ञानेत्र om F G [12] प्रज्ञानेत्रे D [13] प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म om I [14] एतेनैव T

स्यामुष्मिन्स्वर्गे लोके सर्वान्कामानाप्त्वामृतः समभवत्सम-
भवत्[15] ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥[16]

॥ इति द्वितीयारण्यकम् ॥

This ends the second Āraṇyaka, but the majority of the MSS. of the text, and of Sāyana's commentary, and of Ānandatīrtha's own commentary, and his *ṭīkā*, add a seventh Adhyāya, which is:—

ADHYĀYA 7.

वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता मनो मे वाचि प्रतिष्ठितमाविरा-
वीर्मे[1] एधि वेदस्य म आणी स्थः श्रुतं मे मा प्रहासीः[2]नेनाधी-
तेनाहोरात्रान्संदधाम्यृतं वदिष्यामि सत्यं वदिष्यामि[3] तन्मामवतु
तद्वक्तारमवत्ववतु मामवतु वक्तारमवतु वक्तारम् ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥[5]

[15] इति पञ्चमः खण्डः ॥५॥ T, U, MSS of Saṅkara; numbered 25 in A, E, H, K, L, not numbered in D, F, G, 5 in N [16] Text, R; इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥६॥ A, इति द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः L, इति द्वितीय आरण्ये षष्ठोऽध्यायः K; द्वितीयारण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः F, G, इति षष्ठोऽध्यायः D, M; no colophon in E, N; इति ऐतरेये द्वितीये आरण्यके षष्ठोऽध्यायः । उपनिषत्सु तृतीयोऽध्यायः । ओं तत्सत् । T. L adds द्वितीयारण्यकं समाप्तं । Pājārāma's ed. begins इत्यैतरेयारण्यके, and then as T

[1] °विरावीर्म° K, see on I, 1, 1, in the Sāntimantra, Eggeling, *India Office Catal.*, p 117. [2] प्रहासीद् T, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda* [3] वादिष्या A here. [4] °मा३म् D [5] This occurs in A, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, O, Q, R, S, T, U. In P, however, it is placed at the beginning of the Upanishad, and in S at the end of Āraṇyaka V, and see also note on I, 1, 1. It does not occur in most MSS of

Saṅkara's commentary, and it is omitted even in L, which is a complete MS of all the text. It appears clearly not to have been known to Saṅkara. It is, however, *known to Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary in the MSS, H and O.* In the edition, U, of Ānandatīrtha's commentary on Saṅkara, it is said: षष्ठप्रपाठकस्य भाष्यं स्पष्टत्वादात्मतत्त्वाप्रतिपादनाच्च श्रीमच्छङ्कराचार्यैर्न कृतमित्येतट्टीकात एव ज्ञायते । सा तु टीका दीपिकातोऽभिन्नैवेति ज्ञासाच्च न संगृहीता । M, N, Q, and apparently Max Muller's MS., *S B E*, I, 246, n 2, have एवं षष्ठेऽध्याये तत्त्वविद्यां परिसमाप्य सप्तमे (so N, Q. सप्तसु श्रीमत्परिव्राजकाचार्य add M) शान्तिकरो मन्त्रः पठितः वाङ्मे मनसीत्यादि । तस्य स्पष्टार्थत्वादात्मतत्त्वाप्रतिपादकत्वाच्च भाष्यकारैर्न व्याख्यातः । स मन्दानां बोधाय दीपिकाकारोक्तरीत्या व्याख्यायते । यथोक्त° *&c*, exactly as in Sāyana's commentary. The end is इति श्रीसप्तमाध्यायस्य दीपिका संपूर्णा M, इति सप्तमाध्यायदीपिका समाप्ता N. The question arises whether this wholesale borrowing was due to Ānandatīrtha or not. On the whole the evidence is against the view that it was. (1) It compels us to date Ānandatīrtha after Sāyana, which is (*a*) contradictory to the accepted dates of either writer, and (*b*) cannot be reconciled with the fact that *Sāyana sometimes follows Ānandatīrtha closely in his commentary*, cf on II, 4, 3. (2) It is of course clear from the consensus of MS evidence that the explanation of the last section was added at a comparatively early date to Ānandatīrtha's commentary, but this could easily have happened, and as a matter of fact the alteration needed to introduce the extract was very slight, as Sāyana begins षष्ठे तत्त्वविद्यां परिसमाप्य सप्तमे शान्तिकरं मन्त्रं पठति । वाङ्मे मनसीति । The addition was very natural, since the fact that the Adhyāya is recognized by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary shows that it had already in his time become a recognized part of the Āraṇyaka. In Jones' MS (Tawney and Thomas *Catalogue of Two Collections of Sanskrit MSS*, p 2) we have the commentary of Saṅkara without the *ṭīkā*, followed by 'Mādhava's' commentary as in the edition. After II, 7, E continues हरिः ॐ । अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत् । वाङ्मे मनसि प्रतिष्ठिता । कोऽयमात्मेति वयमुपास्महे । पुरुषे ह वा अयमादितो गर्भो भवति । स ईक्षतेमे नु लोकाश्च लोकपालाश्च । ता एता देवताः सृष्टाः । आत्मा वा इदमेक एवाग्र आसीत् । तथैते लोकाः । तद्वा इद बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्यशस्त इन्द्रः । तद्वा इद बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य वा एतस्य । तद्वा इद बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तद्वैतदेके । यो ह वै यज्ञो यज्ञं वेद । स एष पुरुषस्समुद्रः । तस्य य आत्मानमाविस्तरां वेद । यो ह वा आत्मानं पञ्चविधमुक्थं वेद । तद्वा इदं बृहतीसहस्रं संपन्नं तस्य यानि व्यञ्जनानि । विश्वामित्रं ह्येतदहश्शंसिष्यन्तम् । एष च एष विभ्राजः । एष इदं लोकमभ्यार्चत् । आपाऽः इति आप इति । अथातो

विभूतयोऽस्य पुरुषस्य । तस्य वाक्तन्तिर्नामानि दामानि । त देवाः प्राणयन्त तं प्रपदाभ्या प्रापद्यत । अथातो रेतसः सृष्टिः । उक्थमुक्थमिति वै प्रजा वदन्ति । एष पन्था एतत्कर्म । एष पन्था अष्टौ । एष इमस्त्वारि । यो ह वा आत्मानमष्टौ । आत्मा वै पदः । पुरुष एका । कोऽयमेका । वाङ्म एका । एष पन्था विश्वामित्रं ह्यात्मा वै पद् । हरिः ओं । इति द्वितीयारण्य समाप्तम् । The other MSS end as follows ॥२६॥ इत्यैतरेयद्वितीयारण्यके सप्तमोऽध्यायः । द्वितीयारण्यक समाप्त । A, ॥२६॥ इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः ॥७॥ इति द्वितीयमारण्यक समाप्त । F, ॥२६॥४॥ (rest as in F) G, इति सप्तमोऽध्यायः द्वितीयारण्यः D, ॥२६॥ इति द्वितीय आरण्ये सप्तमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तः K R ends as in text, but with समाप्तः added

## ॥ अथ तृतीयारण्यकम् ॥

### Adhyāya 1.

अथातः संहिताया[1] उपनिषत् । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वायुः संहितेति माण्डूकेय आकाशः संहितेत्यस्य माक्षव्यो वेदयांचक्रे । स हाविपरिहृतो मेने न मेऽस्य पुत्रेण समगादिति । समाने वै तत्परिहृतौ मेन इत्यागस्त्यः समानं ह्येतद्भवति वायुश्चाकाशश्च[2] । इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । वाक्पूर्वरूपं मन उत्तररूपं प्राणः संहितेति[3] शूरवीरो[4] माण्डूकेयः । अथ हास्य पुत्र आह ज्येष्ठो मनः पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं मनसा[5] वा अग्रे संकल्पयत्यथ वाचा व्याहरति तस्मान्मन एव पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपं प्राणस्त्वेव संहितेति । समानमेनयोरत्र पितुश्च पुत्रस्य च । स एषोऽश्वरथः प्रष्टिवाहनो मनोवाक्प्राणसंहतः[6] । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[7] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । इति नु माण्डूकेयानाम् ॥१॥

अथ शाक्ल्यस्य । पृथिवी पूर्वरूपं द्यौरुत्तररूपं वृष्टिः संधिः पर्जन्यः संधाता । तदुतापि यत्रैतद्बलवदनुशृह्णन्संदधदहोरात्रे

[1] संहिताय B. [2] च only, R, B, &c., चेति S. [3] संहिते A [4] भूरो धीरो E. [5] मनसैवाग्रे B. [6] संहितः B; संहितुतः E. [7] प्रजय B.

[1] °नु° R, S, &c.; corr. Bohtlingk; cf. Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII, 2.

वर्षति द्यावापृथिव्यौ समधातामित्युताप्याहुः । इती[2] न्वधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । पुरुषो ह वा अयं सर्व आन्दं द्वे विदले भवत इत्याहुस्तस्येदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवस्तंचायमन्तरेणाकाशो यथासौ द्यावापृथिव्यावन्तरेणाकाशः । तस्मिन्हास्मिन्नाकाशे प्राण आयत्तो यथामुष्मिन्नाकाशे वायुरायत्तः । यथामूनि त्रीणि ज्योतींष्येवमिमानि पुरुषे त्रीणि[6] ज्योतींषि यथासौ दिव्यादित्य एवमिदं[5] शिरसि चक्षुर्यथासावन्तरिक्षे विद्युदेवमिदमात्मनि हृदयं यथायमग्निः पृथिव्यामेवमिदमुपस्थे रेतः । एवमु ह स्म सर्वलोकमात्मानमनुविधायाहेदमेव पृथिव्या रूपमिदं दिवः । स य एवमेतां संहितां[7] वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥

[अथातो निर्भुजप्रवादाः । पृथिव्यायतनं निर्भुजं दिव्यायतनं प्रतृणमन्तरिक्षायतनमुभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टावराभ्या[1] स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं प्रतृणं ब्रुवन्तमुपवदेदच्योष्टा उत्तराभ्यां स्थानाभ्यामित्येनं ब्रूयात् । यस्त्वेवोभयमन्तरेणाह तस्य नास्त्युपवादः । यद्धि संधिं विवर्तयति तन्निर्भुजस्य रूपमथ यच्छुद्धे अक्षरे अभिव्याहरति तत्प्रतृणस्याग्र उ एवोभयमन्तरेणोभयं व्याप्तं भवति] अन्नाद्यकामो

[2] इति S[1,2,5]   [3] विवस् A   वस् F   [4] So I read for तस्मिन्हस्मिन् D G H K L S   तस्मिन्नाकाशे F   तस्मिन्नस्मिन्नाकाशे A R   यथा—वायुर lost in B
[5] त्रीणि—इदं lost in B   [6] एवमिदम् lost in B   [7] संहितां D, सम° F
[1] °वर आभ्या B

निर्भुजं ब्रूयात्स्वर्गकामः प्रतृण्णमुभयकाम उभयमन्तरेण । अथ यद्येनं निर्भुजं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेत्पृथिवीं देवतामारः पृथिवी त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्[2]येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनं प्रतृण्णं ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदेद्दिवं[3] देवतामारो[4] द्यौस्त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ यद्येनमु[5]भयमन्तरेण ब्रुवन्तं पर उपवदे[6]दंतरिक्षं[7] देवतामारोऽन्तरिक्षं त्वा देवता रिष्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च ब्रुवन्वा[8] ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमेव यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न[9] एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । नातिद्युम्ने चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो[10] अस्तु ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह स्माह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥३॥

अथातोऽनुव्याहाराः । प्राणो वंश इति विद्यात् । स य एनं प्राणं वंशमुपवदेच्छक्नुवन्[1]चेन्मन्येत प्राणं[2] वंशं समधाँ३[3] प्राणं मा वंशं संदधतं न शक्नोषीत्याह प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । अथ चेदशक्नुवन्तं[4] मन्येत प्राणं वंशं समधित्सिषं तं नाशकः संधातुं प्राणस्त्वा वंशो हास्यतीत्येनं ब्रूयात् । यथा तु कथा च ब्रुवन्वा[5] ब्रुवन्तं वा ब्रूयादभ्याशमे[6]व यत्तथा स्यात् । न त्वेवान्यत्कुशलाद्ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् । अतिद्युम्न एव ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयात् ।

[2] क्षप्यति B [3] देदिव F, G [4] देवतामरो A. [5] नमु° B. [6] उपवद्वदेद्र A [7] अन्तरिक्षं देवतामारो om L, अन्तरीक्षं B in text [8] See explanatory notes [9] अतिद्युम्ने—ब्रूयान् om. F, G [10] °न्नमो स्तु B

[1] ॰चेन् om B [2] प्राणवंशं E: [3] समधां A, B [4] छक्नुवन्तं D. [5] See explanatory notes on III, 1, 3 [6] आभ्याशम् B, E (yet correctly in III, 1, 4)

नातिद्युम्ने[7] चन ब्राह्मणं ब्रूयान्नमो अस्तु[8] ब्राह्मणेभ्य इति ह स्माह शूरवीरो माण्डूकेयः ॥४॥

अथ खल्वाहुर्निर्भुजवक्त्राः । पूर्वमक्षरं[1] पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तररूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण सा संहितेति । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[3] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ वयं ब्रूमो निर्भुजवक्त्रा इति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः पूर्वमेवाक्षरं पूर्वरूपमुत्तरमुत्तररूपं योऽवकाशः पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण येन संधिं विवर्तयति येन स्वरास्वरं[5] विजानाति येन मात्रामात्रां विभजते सा संहितेति । स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[3] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति । अथ हास्य पुत्र[6] आह मध्यमः प्रातीबोधीपुत्रोऽक्षरे खल्विमे अविकर्षन्ननेकीकुर्वन्यथावर्णमाह तद्यासौ मात्रा पूर्वरूपोत्तररूपे अन्तरेण संधिविज्ञपनी साम तद्भवति सामैवाहं संहितां मन्य इति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । बृहस्पते न परः साम्नो[10] विदुरिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति ॥५॥

[7] माद्युम्ने A [8] नमो स्तु B

[1] पूर्वरूपम् F [2] रूपम् only B [3] प्रजयः B (with *jihvāmūlīya* as usual)
[4] उत्तरम् om G [5] स्वरा स्वर A, K, L; स्वरास्वर B [6] पुत्र आह om B
[7] प्राचीबोधी B [8] °नेकीकुर्वन् B [9] °द्भवति—प्रज lost in B
[10] साम्ना G [11] °र्वमायुरे lost in B

बृहद्रथन्तरयो रूपेण संहिता संधीयत इति तारुक्ष्यः[1]। वाग्वै रथन्तरस्य रूपं प्राणो बृहत उभाभ्यामु खलु संहिता संधीयते वाचा च प्राणेन च। एतस्यां ह स्मोपनिषदि संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते तारुक्ष्यः[2]। एतस्यां[3] ह स्म मात्रायां संवत्सरं गा रक्षयते तारुक्ष्यः। तद[4]प्येतदृ[5]षिणोक्तम्। रथन्तरमा जभारा वसिष्ठो भरद्वाजो बृहदा चक्रे अग्नेरिति॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[6] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। वाक्प्राणेन संहितेति[8] कौण्ठरव्यः प्राणः पवमानेन पवमानो विश्वैर्देवैर्विश्वे देवाः स्वर्गेण लोकेन स्वर्गो लोको ब्रह्मणा सैषावरपरा संहिता। स यो हैतामवरपरां संहितां वेदैवं हैव स प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन संधीयते[9] यथैषा संहिता। स यदि परेण वोपसृतः[10] स्वेन वार्थेनाभिव्याहरेदभिव्याहार्षे[11]नैव विद्यादिवं संहितागमद्विदुषां देवानामेवं भविष्यतीति। शश्वत्तथा स्यात्। स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन[9] सर्वमायुरेति। वाक्संहितेति पञ्चालचण्डः। वाचा वै वेदाः संधीयन्ते वाचा छन्दांसि वाचा मित्राणि संदधति वाचा सर्वाणि भूतान्यथो वागेवेदं सर्वमिति। तद्यत्रैतदधीते वा भाषते

[1] तार्क्ष्यः B, D, H, S (but S[1345] has तारु°). [2] तार्क्ष्यः A (marked as incorrect), B, D, H, S (but not S[345]) [3] एतस्या—तद्द om. B; तार्क्ष्यस् A; तार्क्ष्यः D, H, L (elsewhere तारु°), S (but not S[34679]) [4] तप्य B, अप्येतद् om. F. [5] °षिर् B. [6] प्रजयः B [7] थावत् L [8] संहिते B. [9] संधीयते—लोकेन om. F, G, [10] स्रणः or °जः B. [11] व्याहारेद° B, व्याहार्य नैवेव R in text, नै विद्यात् K, read perhaps °हरन्न°.

वा वाचि तदा प्राणो भवति वाक्तदा प्राणं रेळ्हयथ यच्च तूष्णीं वा[12] भवति स्वपिति वा[13] प्राणे तदा वाग्भवति प्राणस्तदा वाचं रेळ्हि तावन्योन्यं रीळ्हो वाग्वै माता प्राणः पुत्रः। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। एकः सुपर्णः स समुद्रमा विवेश स इदं विश्वं भुवनं वि चष्टे। तं पाकेन मनसापश्यमन्तितस्तं[14] माता रेळ्हि स उ रेळ्हि मातरमिति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति। अथातः प्रजापतिसंहिता। जाया पूर्वरूपं पतिरुत्तररूपं पुत्रः संधिः प्रजननं संधानं सैषादितिः[15] संहिता। अदितिर्हीदं सर्वं यदिदं किञ्च पिता च माता च पुत्रश्च प्रजननं च। तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम्। अदितिर्माता स पिता स पुत्र इति ॥ स य एवमेतां संहितां वेद संधीयते प्रजया[16] पशुभिर्यशसा ब्रह्मवर्चसेन स्वर्गेण लोकेन सर्वमायुरेति सर्वमायुरेति ॥६॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[17]

## ADHYÂYA 2.

प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शाकल्यः। तद्यथा शालावंशे सर्वेऽन्ये वंशाः समाहिताः स्युरेवमस्मिन्प्राणे चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो

[12] वाग् B [13] वा om A, वाक् G [14] तस्मा B, मात D [15] स सैषादि° B [16] प्रजयः B, which also has *ddh* for *th*. [17] Text A (with समाप्तः), R, इत्यृग्वेदसंहितारण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः B, तृतीयारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः F, तृतीय आरण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः G, इति तृतीय आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः K, इति चतुर्दशोऽध्यायः L, प्रथमोऽध्यायः D, no colophon E

[1] एतस्मिन् B.

वागिन्द्रियाणि शरीरं सर्वं आत्मा समाहितः । तस्यैतस्यात्मनः प्राण ऊष्मरूपमस्थीनि स्पर्शरूपं मज्जानः स्वररूपं मांसं लोहितमित्येतदन्यच्चतुर्थमन्तस्थारूपमिति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः । त्रयं त्वेव न[3] एतत्प्रोक्तम् । तस्यैतस्य त्रयस्यास्त्रां[4] मज्ज्ञां पर्वणामिति त्रीणीतः[5] षष्टिशतानि त्रीणीतस्तानि सप्त विंशतिशतानि[6] भवन्ति सप्त च वै शतानि विंशतिश्च[7] संवत्सरस्याहोरात्राः । स एषो ऽहःसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमहःसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं[8] छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाहं सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलोकतामश्नुते पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥१॥[10]

अथ कौण्ठरव्यः । त्रीणि षष्टिशतान्यक्षराणां त्रीणि षष्टिशतान्यूष्मणां त्रीणि षष्टिशतानि संधीनाम् । यान्यक्षराण्यवोचामाहानि तानि यानूष्मणो ऽवोचाम[1] रात्रयस्ता यान्संधीनवोचामाहोरात्राणां ते संधय इत्यधिदैवतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । यान्यक्षराण्यधिदैवतमवोचामास्थीनि तान्यध्यात्मम् । यानूष्मणो ऽधिदैवतमवोचाम मज्जानस्ते ऽध्यात्मम् । एष ह वै संप्रतिप्राणो यन्मज्जैतद्रेतो न ह वा ऋते[3] प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्यते यद्वा ऋते[3] प्राणाद्रेतः सिच्येत पूयेन्न[4] संभवेत् । यान्संधीनधिदैवतम-

[2] °मन्तस्थारूपम् B and the other MSS., besides R and S [3] न इत्य् B, cf on III, 2, 2. [4] B inserts ३(?) after each of the three genitives and nasalizes पर्वणां. [5] त्रीणित B [6] सप्त विंशतिश B, as reported by Max Muller, but this is wrong. [7] विंशतिश् A; संम्वात्स° B. [8] °मानच° B. [9] Lost to end in B, except र्वमायुरेति. [10] Numbered 7 in A, E, F, G, H, K, L, १ in B, D.

[1] चामाह (?) B. [2] सन्धीन्य° B. [3] रिते B. [4] पूयेन B.

वोचाम पर्वाणि तान्यध्यात्मम् । तस्यैतस्य[5] चयस्यास्थ्नां मज्ज्ञां पर्वणामिति पञ्चेतश्चत्वारिंशच्छतानि पञ्चेतस्तदशीतिसहस्रं भवन्त्यशीतिसहस्रं वा अर्कलिनो बृहतीरहरहरभिसंपादयन्ति । स एषो ऽक्षरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो[8] वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतमक्षरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं वेदाक्षराणां सायुज्यं सरूपतां सलोकतामश्नुते[9] पुत्री पशुमान्भवति सर्वमायुरेति ॥२॥[10]

चत्वारः पुरुषा इति[1] बाध्वः[2] शरीरपुरुषश्छन्दःपुरुषो वेदपुरुषो महापुरुष इति । शरीरपुरुष इति यमवोचाम स य एवायं[3] दैहिक आत्मा तस्य योऽयमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा स रसः । छन्दःपुरुष इति यमवोचामाक्षरसमाम्नाय एव तस्यैतस्याकारो रसः । वेदपुरुष इति यमवोचाम येन वेदान्वेद ऋग्वेदं यजुर्वेदं सामवेदं तस्यैतस्य ब्रह्मा रसः । तस्माद्ब्रह्माणं[4] ब्रह्मिष्ठं कुर्वीत यो यज्ञस्योल्बणं पश्येत् । महापुरुष इति यमवोचाम संवत्सर एव प्रध्वंसयन्नन्यानि भूतान्येकधा भावयन्नन्यानि[5] तस्यैतस्यासावादित्यो रसः । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदिति विद्यात् । तस्मात्पुरुषं पुरुषं प्रत्यादित्यो भवति ।

[5] B inserts चय स्वेद न इत्येतत्प्रोक्तम् which is borrowed from III 2 1 above and reads तस्यैतस्य चयस्यासास्थ्नाम् [6] कारि° B [7] °रहरहर् B and संपदयन्ति [8] om B [9] अश्नुमान् F om ting पुत्री पशुमान् [10] Numbered 8 in A E H K L; 2 8 in F G 2 in B D

[1] इति om and la una marked in A [2] बाध्य R in text. [3] °हम् B [4] ब्राह्मण B. [5] °न्नान्यानि B

तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । चित्रं देवानामुदगादनीकं चक्षुर्मित्रस्य वरुणस्याग्नेः । आप्रा द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरिक्षं सूर्य आत्मा जगतस्तस्थुषश्चेति ॥ एतामनुविधं[6] संहितां संधीयमानां मन्य इति ह स्माह बाध्वः । एतं ह्येव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसन्त एतमग्नावध्वर्यव एतं महाव्रते छन्दोगा एतमस्यामेतं दिव्येतं वायावेतमाकाश एतमप्स्वेतमोषधीष्वेतं[7] वनस्पतिष्वेतं चन्द्रमस्येतं नक्षत्रेष्वेतं[8] सर्वेषु भूतेष्वेतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते । स एष संवत्सरसंमानश्चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमयश्छन्दोमयो मनोमयो वाङ्मय आत्मा । स य एवमेतं संवत्सरसंमानं चक्षुर्मयं श्रोत्रमयं छन्दोमयं मनोमयं वाङ्मयमात्मानं परस्मै शंसति ॥३॥[9]

दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति न तस्यानूक्ते[1] भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमिति । तदप्येतदृषिणोक्तम् । यस्तित्याज सचिविदं सखायं न तस्य वाच्यपि भागो अस्ति । यदीं शृणोत्यलकं शृणोति न हि[2] प्र वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थामिति ॥ न तस्यानूक्ते भागोऽस्ति न वेद सुकृतस्य पन्थानमित्येतत्तदुक्तं भवति । तस्मादेवं विद्वान्न परस्मा अग्निं[2] चिनुयान्न परस्मै महाव्रतेन स्तुवीत न परस्मा एतदहः शंसेत् । कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मन एवास्य तत्कृतं भवति । स यश्चायमशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मा यश्चासावादित्य एकमेतदित्यवोचाम । तौ

[6] ॰वितांत B. [7] ॰षधिषु B. [8] नक्षत्रेष्वेतं G. [9] Numbered 9 in A, E, H, K, L; 3, 9 in F, G; 3 in B, D.

[1] नस्य B. [2] हि—अग्निम् all, save a few letters and the following न परस्मा, lost in B.

यत्र विहीयेते चन्द्रमा इवादित्यो[3] दृश्यते न रश्मयः प्रादुर्भवन्ति लोहिनी द्यौर्भवति यथा मञ्जिष्ठा व्यस्तः पायुः काककुलायगन्धिकमस्य शिरो वायति संपरेतोऽस्यात्मा न[4] चिरमिव जीविष्यतीति[5] विद्यात्। स यत्करणीयं मन्येत तत्कुर्वीत यदन्ति यच्च दूरक इति सप्त जपेदादित्प्रत्नस्य रेतस इत्येका यत्र ब्रह्मा पवमानेति षळृचं तमसस्परीत्येका। अथापि यत्र छिद्र इवादित्यो दृश्यते रथनाभिरिवाभिख्यायेत छिद्रां वा छायां पश्येत्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यादर्शे वोदके वा जिह्मशिरसं वाशिरसं[6] वात्मानं पश्येद्विपर्यस्ते वा कन्याके जिह्मेन वा दृश्येयातां तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यपिधायाक्षिणी उपेक्षेत तद्यथा बटरकाणि[7] संपतन्तीव[8] दृश्यन्ते तानि यदा न पश्येत्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथाप्यपिधाय कर्णौ उपशृणुयात्स एषो ऽग्नेरिव प्रज्वलतो[9] रथस्येवोपब्दिस्तं[10] यदा न शृणुयात्तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथापि यत्र नील इवाग्निर्दृश्यते यथा मयूरग्रीवामेघे वा विद्युतं[12] पश्येन्मेघे वा विद्युतं न पश्येन्महामेघे वा मरीचीरिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। अथापि यत्र भूमिं ज्वलन्तीमिव पश्येत तदप्येवमेव विद्यात्। इति प्रत्यक्षदर्शनानि। अथ स्वप्नाः[13]। पुरुषं कृष्णं कृष्णदन्तं पश्यति स एनं

[3] एवादित्यो B [4] न म F, G [5] जीवषि (? य) ष्यति B.
[6] वाशरीरमात्मान B, वाशिरस om A, D pr man, G, B has कान्यके *infra*
[7] वटिरकाणि B [8] संपतन्तीवा B, संपतन्ती R in text, सपतन्तीव A, D, F I, G, H, k, L S. [9] ज्वलतो B [10] रथस्य—स्तं om R in text The words are in all MSS. [11] मयूरग्रीव. (or वा) भ्रमेघे B [12] न add k
[13] दर्शनादन्य् and स्वप्नः B, H has in commentary स्वप्नाः उच्यते

हन्ति वराह[14] एनं हन्ति मर्कट एनमास्कन्दयत्याशु वायुरेनं प्रवहति सुवर्णं खादित्वापगिरति[16] मधघ्नाति बिसानि भक्षयत्येकपुण्डरीकं धारयति खरैर्वराहैर्युक्तैर्याति कृष्णां धेनुं कृष्णवत्सां नलदमाली दक्षिणामुखो व्राजयति । स यद्येतेषां किञ्चित्पश्येदुपोष्य पायसं स्थालीपाकं श्रपयित्वा रात्रीसूक्तेन[17] प्रत्यृचं हुत्वान्येनान्नेन ब्राह्मणान्भोजयित्वा चरुं स्वयं प्राश्नीयात् । स योऽँतोऽश्रुतोऽगतोऽमतोऽँनतोऽदृष्टोऽविज्ञातोऽनादिष्टः श्रोता मन्ता द्रष्टादेष्टा घोष्टा विज्ञाता प्रज्ञाता सर्वेषां भूतानामन्तरपुरुषः स म आत्मेति विद्यात् ॥४॥[20]

अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत् । सर्वा ह्येवेमाः सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषद[1] इमां त्वेवाचक्षते । पृथिव्या रूपं स्पर्शा अन्तरिक्षस्योष्माणो दिवः स्वराः । अग्ने रूपं स्पर्शा वायोरूष्माण आदित्यस्य स्वराः । ऋग्वेदस्य रूपं स्पर्शा यजुर्वेदस्योष्माणः[3] सामवेदस्य स्वराः । चक्षुषो रूपं स्पर्शाः श्रोत्रस्योष्माणो मनसः स्वराः । प्राणस्य रूपं स्पर्शा अपानस्योष्माणो व्यानस्य स्वराः । अथ खल्वियं दैवी वीणा भवति तदनुकृतिरसौ मानुषी वीणा भवति । यथास्याः शिर एवममुष्याः शिरो यथास्या उदरमेवं-

[14] वराह—हन्ति om. F, which omits also दृश्यते—°ध्यायेत. [15] एनमास्कन्दति B. [16] °वगिरति B. [17] रात्रिसूक्तन B. [18] स यतश्श्रुतो B. [19] om. B [20] Numbered 10 in A, E, H, K, L; 10, 4 in F; 4, 10 in G; 4 in B, D.

[1] उपनिषद्ॄ B. [2] वायोष्म° F, G. [3] °ष्माण B. [4] उदर B.

ममुष्या ऋम्भणं यथास्यै[5] जिह्वैवममुष्यै वादनं यथास्यास्तन्त्रय एवममुष्या अङ्गुलयो यथास्याः स्वरा एवममुष्याः स्वरा यथास्या स्पर्शा एवममुष्या स्पर्शा यथा ह्येवेयं शब्दवती तर्द्मवत्येवमसौ शब्दवती तर्द्मवती यथा ह्येवेयं लोमशेन चर्मणापिहिता भवत्येवमसौ लोमशेन[7] चर्मणापिहिता[6]। लोमशेन[8] ह स्म[9] वै चर्मणा पुरा[7] वीणा अपिदधति। स यो हैतां दैवीं[10] वीणां वेद श्रुतवदनो भवति भूमिप्रास्य कीर्तिर्भवति यत्र क्व चार्या वाचो भाषन्ते विदुरेनं तत्र। अथातो वायसो यस्यां संसद्यधीयानो वा भाषमाणो वा न विरुरुचिषेत[11] तत्रैतामृचं जपेत्। ओष्ठापिधाना[12] नकुली दन्तैः परिवृता पविः। सर्वस्यै वाच ईशाना चारु मामिह वादयेत्। इति वायसः ॥५॥[13]

अथ हास्मा एतत्कृष्णहारितो वाग्ब्राह्मणमिवोपोदाहरति। प्रजापतिः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा व्यस्रंसत[1] संवत्सरः। स छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधाद्यच्छन्दोभिरात्मानं समदधात्तस्मात्संहिता। तस्यै वा एतस्यै संहितायै णकारो बलं षकारः प्राण आत्मा। स यो हैतौ णकारषकारावनुसंहितमृचो वेद सबलां सप्राणां संहितां

[5] यथा—लो lost in B [6] भवति—°पिहिता om in K but add pr man. [7] लोमशेन—पुरा lost in B Here and above R has पिहिता [8] चर्मणा—लोमशेन om G [9] हम L [10] दैवी B [11] विरुरुचुषेत A F, G, K, L, R S, विरुरुचिषेत B C, D, E, H [12] This verse occurs also in the Santi verses, note on I 1 1, and see explanatory notes [13] Numbered 11 in A, E, H, h, L, 5 11 in F, G, 5 in B D

[1] व्यस्रसदा समत्सर B; प्रमा: E

वेदायुष्यमिति विद्यात्। स यदि विचिकित्सेत्सणकारं ब्रवाणी३[2] अणकाराँ३ इति सणकारमेव ब्रूयात्सषकारं ब्रवाणी३[3] अषकाराँ३ इति सषकारमेव ब्रूयात्। ते यद्वयमनुसंहितमृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकारषकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह ह्रस्वो माण्डूकेयः। अथ यद्वयमनुसंहितमृचोऽधीमहे यच्च माण्डूकेयीयमध्यायं प्रब्रूमस्तेन नो णकारषकारा उपाप्नाविति ह स्माह स्थविरः शाकल्यः [ एतद्ध स्म वै तद्विद्वांस आहुर्ऋषयः कावषेयाः किमर्था वयमध्येष्यामहे किमर्था वयं यक्ष्यामहे[7] वाचि हि प्राणं जुहुमः[8] प्राणे[9] वा वाचं यो[10] ह्येव प्रभवः स एवाप्ययः। ता एताः संहिता नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नाप्रवक्त्र इत्याचार्या आचार्याः ॥६॥[11] ]

॥ इत्यैतरेयतृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[12]

॥ इति तृतीयारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥

[2] The arrangement of the *plutis* is confirmed by the commentary. In ब्रवाणी३ B omits the nasal [3] Nasal om B [4] माण्डूकेयूय B (perhaps for °यी°) [5] °संहिताम् B, [6] उपाप्ना B, against the rule of Sandhi of the Āranyaka [7] वयच्चामहे B [8] जुह्होमः B [9] प्राणो—वाच B in text. [10] चो K [11] Numbered 12 in A, E, H, K, L, 6, 12 in F, G, 6 in B, D [12] इत्यैतरेयारण्यके तृतीयस्य तृतीयस्य तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥३॥ इति तृतीयारण्यक समाप्त A, where the error is worthy of note in view of the so-called Adhyāya in B, द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥२॥ तृतीयारण्यक समाप्त F, G; द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥ तृतीयारण्यः ॥ D, इति तृतीयारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। समाप्तं। K, इति तृतीयारण्यके द्वितीयाध्यायः। इति तृतीयारण्यके समाप्तः। श्री अथातः संहितायाः षट्। प्राणो वशः षट्। अथातः हिताया अथ खल्वियं दी। L, B has इत्युविदे संहितारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः। Then follows the third Adhyāya which is given in

the note on I, 1, 1. E has हरिः ओं। विदा मघवन्। अथ हास्मा एतद्धप्याहारितः। अथ खल्वियं सर्वस्यै वाच उपनिषत्। दुग्धदोहा अस्य वेदा भवन्ति। चत्वारः पुरुषा इति बाध्वः। अथ कौण्ठरव्यः। प्राणो वंश इति स्थविरः शाकल्यः। बृहद्रथंतरयो रूपेण। अथ खल्वाहुर्निर्भुजवक्त्राः। अथातोऽनुव्याहाराः। अथातो निर्भुजप्रवादाः। अथ शाकल्यस्य। अथातस्संहिताया उपनिषत्। अथातस्संहिताष्टौ। प्राणो वंश इति षट्। अथातस्संहिताया द्वादौ। इति तृतीयारण्यं समाप्तं। हरिः ओम्।
R has text with समाप्तः added

## ॥ अथ चतुर्थारण्यकम् ॥

विदा[1] मघवन्विदा गातुमनु शंसिषो दिशः ।
शिक्षा शचीनां पते पूर्वीणां पुरूवसो ॥१॥
आभिष्टुमभिष्टिभिः प्रचेतन प्र चेतय ।
इन्द्र द्युम्नाय न इष एवा[3] हि शक्रः ॥२॥
राये वाजाय वज्रिवः शविष्ठ[4] वज्रिन्नृञ्जसे[5] ।
मंहिष्ठ वज्रिन्नृञ्जस आ याहि पिब मत्स्व ॥३॥
विदा रायः सुवीर्यं भुवो वाजानां पतिर्वशां अनु ।
मंहिष्ठ वज्रिन्नृञ्जसे यः शविष्ठः शूराणाम् ॥४॥
यो मंहिष्ठो[6] मघोनां चिकित्वो[7] अभि नो नय ।
इन्द्रो विदे तमु स्तुषे वशी हि शक्रः ॥५॥
तमूतये हवामहे जेतारमपराजितम्[8] ।
स नः पर्षदति द्विषः[9] क्रतुश्छन्द ऋतं बृहत् ॥६॥

[1] Accents do not appear in A D, F, G K, L, S But the accents are undoubtedly old and the fact that the other verses cited in the book are not usually accented is not in point, since these are non Ṛgvedic verses • Similarly in Āraṇyaka V the non-Ṛgvedic verses are all accented The motive is obvious, that the repeaters of the text should have guidance in repeating verses not from their own Saṃhitā

[2] आविष् A, in R आभिष्टम. [3] एव L [4] शविष्ठः R, dividing here the verse [5] •ञ्जसो F [6] माहिष्ठो F, माहिष्ठो G [7] चिकित्वा L, चिकित्वः R [8] •मुपराजितम् L [9] द्विषत् G

इन्द्रं धनस्य सातये हवामहे जेतारमपराजितम् ।
स नः पर्षदति द्विषः स नः पर्षदति स्त्रिधः ॥७॥
पूर्वस्य यत्ते अद्रिवः सुम्न आ धेहि नो वसो ।
पूर्तिः शविष्ठ शस्यत[10] ईशे हि शक्रः ॥८॥
नूनं तं नव्यं संन्यसे प्रभो जनस्य वृत्रहन् ।
समन्येषु ब्रवावहे शूरो यो[11] गोषु गच्छति सखा सुशेवो अद्वयाः ॥९॥

एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्ना३इ[12] ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हीन्द्रा३ ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि पूषा३न्[13] ॥ एवा ह्येवैवा हि देवा३ः[14] ॥१०॥ एवा हि शक्रो वशी हि शक्रो वशाँ३ अनु[15] ॥ आ यो मर्त्याय मन्यव उपो मर्त्याय मन्यवे ॥ उपेहि विश्वध[16] ॥११॥ विदा मघवन्विदो३म्[17] ॥

॥ इत्यैतरेयारण्यके चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् ॥[18]

[10] शस्यत F  [11] यो om. L  [12] After अग्ना F has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैव ह्री३ एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ, G has इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा ह्यग्ना इन्द्र । एवा ह्येवैवा हि विष्णा३उ,' R has हीन्द्रम् and so A, E, K, L, S has ही३न्द्रम्, D only has हीन्द्रा३ which must clearly be right  [13] पूषन् A, D, E, F, G, K, पूष३में S  [14] देवाः A, D, E, F, G, K, R.  [15] वशाँ D, F, G K, L R, S  A and E have the *pluti* which is more likely to have been wrongly omitted than to have been inserted  [16] विश्वध G.  [17] विदोम् D  [18] इत्यैतरेयचतुर्थारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय. । इति चतुर्थारण्यक समाप्तम् । A; प्रथमोऽध्यायः । इति चतुर्थारण्यः । D, विदा मघवन्नेका । हरिः ओम् । इति चतुर्थारण्यं समाप्तम् । E, चतुर्थारण्यक समाप्तम् । F, चतुर्थारण्यक सं (पूर्णम् in later hand), G, इति चतुर्थ आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्यायः । समाप्तम् । K, इति चतुर्थारण्यक समाप्तम् । L.

These verses occur also in the Kashmir MS of the Ṛgvedic Khilas (=K), which (V, 4) contains Āraṇyaka IV, in Sāmaveda, Naigeyaśākhā, ed. Ajmere, 1901, p 48, in Sāmaveda, Āraṇyasaṃhitā, ed by Fortunatov, p 74, and in Peterson, *Second Report*, p 97 (=P) K reads in v. 1 मघन्, which saves the metre, in vv 3, 4, यच्चिन् before ऋञ्जसे, treating ऋ as equivalent to रि, in v. 4 K, P, SV read राये, probably a mere correction for the difficult रायः, in v 5 SV. has सुहि ईप, SV Ār सुहि ईपे, in vv 6 and 7 SV. has स्वर्पद्व for पर्षद्व, in v 7 द्विषः for स्त्रिधः, in v 8 षद्रियोंऽसुर्मदाय सुम्न. In v 8 K, P have शृख्त, and SV पथी for ईपे. In v 9 K, P have मन्यसे, an obvious correction, see my note, *J. R A S*, 1907, p 224, SV. has चोयेपु and अद्युः The second पुरीषपद is put third in K, the third is omitted in P and SV, and the *last six* in SV. *In the second last K, P* read विश्वथ The variants of the SV. appear all to be in the nature of attempted corrections, and the Aitareya seems to have possessed the oldest form of the words known to us, though it cannot obviously be the original form as Oldenberg points out.

With regard to the accents, in v 2 °हम् is unaccented in K and P as in R, R has नु इर्प. In v 3 पिब is unaccented in K, which is most probably wrong In v 5 both K and R have चिकित्वो, P °कित्वाँ, while K has नर्य, and R has सुपे In v 9 K has गच्छति, which cannot well be correct, and अद्ययाः, also unaccented In the पुरीषपदानि R has एवा, which cannot be accepted, while K has हि unaccented, which is inconsistent K has also no *pluti* in the case of हीन्द्र । हि पूषन् । and हि देवाः । It accents *agnā3i* । *vaṣṇā3u* । of which one or both must be wrong, and it twice has एवैवा. It has आयों मन्यार्य । The accentuation of the first five पुरीषपदानि is *very remarkable, and can only be explained by taking* हि *as unaccented* both when combined and when alone, and by holding that the second एवा in एवैवा is unaccented In the Ajmere ed of the Mahānamnis the पुरीषपदानि appear as एवा हो३३३३३व एवा ह्यग्ने एवाहीन्द्र। एवा हि पूषन् एवा हि देवाः। In P they are very corrupt

॥ अथ पञ्चमारण्यकम् ॥

## ADHYĀYA 1.

महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेन्यः । एकविंशतौ प्रागुपोत्तमायाः समिधाग्निमिति चतस्रः । वैश्वकर्मण ऋषभ उपालम्भनीय उपांशु । आज्यप्रउगे विश्वजितः । होत्राश्चतुर्विंशात् । ईङ्खयन्तीरपस्युव इति च ब्राह्मणाच्छंस्यावपेत प्रातःसवने तीव्रस्याभिवयसो अस्य पाहीति माध्यन्दिने । त्रिकद्रुकेषु महिषो यवाशिरमिति स्तोत्रियः । ‘एन्द्र याह्युप नः परावत’ ‘इन्द्राय हि द्यौरसुरो[1] अनम्नत,’ ‘प्रो ष्वस्मै पुरोरथमित्यतोऽनुरूपः । चतुर्विंशान्मरुत्वतीयस्यातानोऽसत्तु मे जरितः साभिवेग:’ ‘पिबा सोममभि यमुग्र तर्दः’ ‘कया शुभा सवयसः सनीळा’ ‘मरुत्वाँ इन्द्र वृषभो रणाय,’ ‘जनिष्ठा उग्रः सहसे तुरायेति मरुत्वतीयम् । स्थिते मरुत्वतीये होता विसंस्थितसंचरेण निष्क्रम्याग्नीध्रीये तिस्र आज्याहुतीर्जुहोत्यौदुम्बरेण स्रुवेण ।

अनु मामिन्द्रो अनु मां बृहस्पतिरनु सोमो अनु वाग्देव्यावीत् ।
अनु मां मित्रावरुणाविहावतामनु द्यावापृथिवी पूर्वहूतौ ॥
आदित्या मा विश्वे अवन्तु देवाः सप्त राजानो य उताभिषिक्ताः[3] ।
वायुः पूषा वरुणः सोमो अग्निः सूर्यो नक्षत्रैरवत्विह मा नु ॥

[1] °त्राम्—असुरो om. L pr. man. [2] अमूं देव्याम् A [3] So I read for the उद° of MSS. and edd.

पितरो मा विश्वमिदं च भूतं पृश्निमातरो मरुतः स्वर्काः ।
येऽग्निजिह्वा उत वा यजत्रास्ते नो देवाः सुहवाः शर्म यच्छन्तेति ॥

दक्षिणे मार्जालीये दश सुच्युत्तमां चतुर्गृहीतं पूर्वमवदायोत्तरतोऽग्नेरुपनिधाय विहरणप्रभृति मध्यन्दिने मार्जालीयो जागरितो भवति तस्मिन्परिवृते जुहोति प्राग्द्वारे वोदग्द्वारे वा प्रागुदग्द्वारे[4] वा अग्निरिवानाधृष्यः पृथिवीव सुषदा भूयासम् । अन्तरिक्षमिवानाप्यं द्यौरिवानाधृष्यो भूयासम् । सूर्य इवाप्रतिधृष्यश्चन्द्रमा इव पुनर्भूर्भूयासम् । मन इवापूर्वं वायुरिव श्लोकभूर्भूयासम् । अहरिव स्वं रात्रिरिव प्रियो भूयासम् । गाव इव पुनर्भुवो मिथुनमिव मरीचयो भूयासम् । आप इव रस ओषधय इव रूपं भूयासम् । अन्नमिव विभु यज्ञ इव प्रभुर्भूयासम् । ब्रह्मेव लोके क्षत्रमिव श्रियां[5] भूयासम् । यदग्न एषा समितिर्भवातीति । अथ विभजाथ वीर्येति चीरयनन्वृचम् । अथ तिष्ठन्नादित्यमुपतिष्ठते पर्यावृत्ते प्रदक्षिणमावृत्यैतैश्चैवा-स्वाहाकारैरेह्येवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मधु इमं तीव्रसुतं पिबा३ इदं मधू[6]३ इदं मध्विति च । प्रेष्याः संशास्ति पूर्णकुम्भास्तिस्रोऽवमाः षळुत्तमाः । इमं धिष्ण्यमुदकुम्भं च त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं परिव्रजाथ दक्षिणैः पाणिभिर्दक्षिणानूरूनाघ्नाना एह्येवा३ इदं मधू३ इदं मध्विति चरन्तः[7] ॥१॥[8]

[4] om R in text; it is in A, D, E, F, G, K, L, R in commentary, S [5] भूयास् add A [6] मधू३ om F (at end of a leaf). [7] °न्तु° G. [8] The accents are taken from E and R. R has अनु मा before बृहस्पतिः and अनु वाग्; also उत वा यजत्रास् and नो नु. If मानु is read, with Sāyaṇa, the accent must be altered In देवाः सुहवाः there is probably a vocative, if not, the accent must be changed.

उपाकृते स्तोत्रे चैवं निनयाथाचोत्तरे च मार्जालीये शेषमन्तर्वेदीति। प्रदक्षिणमग्निं निष्क्रम्यायेण यूपं पुरस्तात्प्रत्यङ्मुखस्तिष्ठन्नग्नेः शिर उपतिष्ठते नमस्ते गायत्राय[1] यत्ते शिर इति। तेनैव यथेतं प्रत्येत्य दक्षिणमुदङ्मुखः पक्षं नमस्ते राथन्तराय यस्ते दक्षिणः पक्ष इति। अपरेणाग्निपुछमतिक्रम्य प्राङ्मुख उत्तरं नमस्ते बृहते यस्त उत्तरः पक्ष इति। पश्चात्प्राङ्पुछं नमस्ते भद्राय यत्ते पुछ या ते प्रतिष्ठेति। दक्षिणतः पुछस्यात्मानं[2] नमस्ते राजनाय यस्त आत्मेति॥२॥

[यथेतं सद प्रसर्पति। पुरस्तात्प्रेङ्ख उपक्लृप्तो भवति। स्थूणे रज्जू वीवध इत्येतत्प्रक्षाल्य तीर्थेन प्रपाद्योत्तरेणाग्नीध्रीयं परिव्रज्य पूर्वया द्वारा सदः सर्वान्धिष्ण्यानुत्तरेण। औदुम्बराणि काष्ठानि प्रेङ्खस्य भवन्ति पालाशानि मिश्राणि वा। त्रीणि फलकान्युभयतस्तष्टानि द्वे वा सूच्यश्च तावत्यः] इषुमात्रः प्राङ्प्रेङ्खो निमुष्टिकस्तिर्यङ्ङुदग्गंयः[2] प्रागग्राभ्यां सूचीभ्यां समुतः। दक्षिणोत्तरे स्थूणे निखायाभितो होतृषदनं[3] वीवधमत्यादधात्यास्यसमितं कर्तुः। कुशासु छिद्राणि प्रेङ्खस्य भवन्ति रज्जुभ्यामूर्ध्वमुद्वयति दक्षिणतो[4] दक्षिणयोत्तरतः सव्यया दार्भ्ये त्रिगुणे स्यातां सव्यदक्षिणे पञ्चव्यायामे द्विगुणे वीवधे त्रिः प्रदक्षिणं पर्यस्योर्ध्वमग्निं निष्टर्क्यं बध्नाति। शाखाभिर्बृसीभिर्वा पर्येषन्त्य-

[1] गाय A. [2] पुछ स्य A. [3] D omits the number and so reckons the following Khandas as nos 2 5 instead of 3-6

[1] ग्वदग A [2] •ग्य A [3] •पदन R in text [4] om R in text.

प्रकास्पि। चतुरङ्गुलेनैष[5] विभूमः प्रेङ्खः स्यान्मुष्टिमात्रेण वा। दक्षिणत उदाहिततरः समो वा। पदमात्रे धिष्ण्यात्॥३॥[6]

निष्ठिते प्रेङ्खे होता वाणमौदुम्बरं शततन्तुमुभाभ्यां परिगृह्योत्तरत उपोहते यथा वीणाम्। सप्तभिश्छन्दोभिश्चतुरुत्तरैः स्थानान्यस्योर्ध्वमुद्गृह्णीयादृशभिर्वा। गायत्रेण त्वा छन्दसोदूहाम्यौष्णिहेन त्वानुष्टुभेन त्वा बार्हतेन त्वा पाङ्क्तेन त्वा त्रैष्टुभेन त्वा जागतेन त्वा वैराजेन त्वा द्वैपदेन त्वातिछन्दसा त्वेति। छन्दांस्यनुक्रम्य स्थानानामनुपरिक्रमणमौदुम्बर्यार्द्रया शाखया सपलाशया मूलदेशेन वाणं चिरूर्ध्वमुल्लिखति। प्राणाय त्वापानाय त्वा व्यानाय त्वोल्लिखामीति। अन्येभ्योऽपि कामेभ्यः पुनरपि न तूल्लिखामीति ब्रूयात्। अथैनं सशाखं छन्दोगेभ्यः प्रयच्छति। भूतेभ्यस्त्वेति पश्चार्द्धे फलके पाणी प्रतिष्ठापयति प्राणमनुप्रेङ्खस्वेति प्राञ्चं प्रेङ्खं प्रणयति व्यानमनुवीङ्खस्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानमन्वीङ्खस्वेत्यभ्यात्मम्। भूर्भुवः स्वरिति जपति। प्राणाय त्वेति प्राञ्चमेव व्यानाय त्वेति तिर्यञ्चमपानाय त्वेत्यभ्यात्मम्। वसवस्त्वा गायत्रेण छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति पश्चार्द्धे फलकेऽरत्नी प्रतिष्ठापयति। अथ पूर्वे फलकं नाना पाणिभ्यामभिपद्येत यथाहिः[1] स्रप्स्यन्। मध्यमं स्रुवुकेनोपस्पृशेद्द्वयोर्वा संधिम्[3]। रुद्रास्त्वा त्रैष्टुभेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति दक्षिणं[4] सक्थ्यतिहरति। आदित्यास्त्वा जागतेन छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वा-

[5] °ङ्गुलेन A. [6] Numbered 2 in D

[1] °न्वी° S [2] यथाहि A, D, E, K, L, यथा हि S; थाहि F, G. [3] संधि A.
[4] दक्षिणं—हरति om. A

रोहामीति[4] सव्यम्। विश्वे त्वा देवा आनुष्टुभेन[5] छन्दसारोहन्तु तानन्वारोहामीति समारोहति पश्चात्स्वस्य धिष्ण्यस्य दक्षिणं पादं प्राञ्चं प्रतिष्ठापयत्यथ सव्यं यदेतरः[6] श्राम्येदथेतरं यदेतरोऽथेतरं। नोभौ विभूमौ कुर्यात्। कूर्चान्होत्रकाः समारोहन्ति ब्रह्मा चौदुम्बरीमासन्दीमुद्गाता। यदि कस्मैचिदवश्यकर्मणे[7] जिगमिषेदादिश्य पालं प्राङ्वरुह्य[8] चरित्वा तमर्थमेवमेवाजपयावृतारोहेत्॥४॥[9]

प्रस्तोतारं संशास्ति पञ्चविंशस्य स्तोमस्य तिसृष्वर्धतृतीयास्वर्धचयोदशासु वा परिशिष्टासु प्रथमं प्रतिहारं प्रब्रूतादिति। अर्धचयोदशासु प्रवाचयतेति[1] जातूकर्ण्यः। प्रोक्ते जपति। सुपर्णोऽसि गरुत्मान्प्रेमां वाचं वदिष्यामि बहु वदिष्यन्तीं बहु पतिष्यन्तीं बहु करिष्यन्तीं बहु सनिष्यन्तीं बहोर्भूयः करिष्यन्तीं स्वर्गच्छन्तीं[2] स्वर्वदिष्यन्तीं[3] स्वः पतिष्यन्तीं स्वः करिष्यन्तीं स्वः सनिष्यन्तीं स्वरिमं यज्ञं वक्ष्यन्तीं स्वर्मा यजमानं वक्ष्यन्तीमिति। दीक्षिते यजमानशब्दो नादीक्षिते। स्वरमुमिति[4] योऽस्य प्रियः स्यान्न तु वक्ष्यन्तीमिति ब्रूयात्। उक्थवीर्याणि च। सं प्राणो वाचा समहं वाचा सं चक्षुर्मनसा समहं मनसा सं श्रोत्रमात्मना समहमात्मना मयि महान्मयि भर्गो मयि भगो मयि भुजो मयि स्तोभो मयि स्तोमो मयि[5] श्लोको मयि

[5] अनुष्टुभेन G [6] यदेतर K, L, यदेत F, G, यदेतर R in text [7] कर्मिणे D sec. man., F, G, K, L, °णो S [8] प्राङ्ग° F, G [9] Numbered 3 in D

[1] वाचयत्विति F. [2] स्वर्गच्छन्ती om A [3] स्वर्वदिष्यन्ती om. D, E, S[1-3]. [4] स्वर G [5] मयि श्लोको om F

घोषो मयि यशो मयि श्रीर्मयि कीर्तिर्मयि भुक्तिरिति । आहूय वागिति जपति । त्रय आहावाः शस्त्रादेर्निविदः परिधानीयाया इति । शब्दानध्वर्यवः कारयन्ति[6] । एतस्मिन्नहनि प्रभूतमन्नं दद्यात् । राजपुत्रेण चर्म व्याधयन्त्याघ्नन्ति भूमिदुन्दुभिं पत्न्यश्च काण्डवीणा भूतानां च मैथुनं ब्रह्मचारिपुंश्चल्योः संप्रवादो ऽनेकेन साम्ना निष्केवल्याय स्तुवते राजनस्तोत्रियेण प्रतिपद्यते ॥५॥[7]

तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तां सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वा भूय इद्वावृधे वीर्याय । नृणामु त्वा नृतमं गीर्भिरुक्थैरिति तिस्रः । अत्र हैके स्वादोः स्वादीयः स्वादुना सृजा समदः सु मधु[1] मधुनाभि योधीरित्यात्मन[2] एते पदे उद्धृत्य पक्षपदे[3] प्रत्यवदधात्यश्वायन्तो मघवन्निन्द्र वाजिनो गामश्वं रथ्यमिन्द्र सं किरेत्येतयोश्च स्थान इतरे । श्रियमह गोरश्वमात्मन्धत्ते सं पक्षयोः[5] पतनाय । नदं व ओदतीनामित्येतयैतानि व्यतिषजति पादैः पादान्बृहतीकारं नदवन्त्युत्तराणि प्रथमायां च पुरुपाक्षराण्युपदधाति पादेष्वेकैकमवसाने तृतीयवर्जं स खलु विहरति । अपि निदर्शनायोदाहरिष्यामः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं पु । नदं व ओदतीनाम्[6] । यतो जज्ञ उग्रस्त्वेषनृम्णो रु । नदं योयुवतीनो३म्[7] ॥ सद्यो जज्ञानो नि रिणाति शत्रून् । पतिं वो

[6] कारयन्ति F. [7] Numbered 4 in D.

[1] सुमधुना only, A. [2] °त्मना F, G. [3] पक्ष om. A. [4] °रश्मम् K, R in text [5] संपचियोः F. [6] ओदतीनाम् A, E, K, L, R, S; °ना३म् D, F, G. [7] युवतीनोम् K; युवतीनाम् E, L; युवतीना३म् F, D pr. man. corrected sec. man to युवतीणो३म्; text, A, G, R, S (युवतीनो in text).

अघ्यानाम्[8] । अनु[9] यं विश्वे मदन्त्यूमाः यो । धेनूनामिषुध्य-
सो३मिँति[10] ॥ एवमेतां त्रिः । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु राजनेन
साम्ना स्तुवीरन्यथास्थानं ता इहैवेमाः । असमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तु-
वीरन्समाम्नातस्य[11] तावतीरुद्धृत्य तत्र ताः शंसेदिहो[12] एवेमाः ।
अन्यासु चेत्प्राक्सूददोहसस्ताः । तदिदासेत्येतदादि शस्त्रम् ।
अविहृतश्चात्र प्रतिगरः । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदादिः
सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥ ६ ॥[13]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥[14]

## ADHYĀYA 2

ग्रीवाः । यस्येदमा रजस्युजो युजो वनं सहः । इन्द्रस्य रन्त्यं
बृहत् ॥ नाधृष आ दधर्ष दाधृषाण[1] धृषितं शवः । पुरा यदीमति
व्यथिरिन्द्रस्य धृषितं सहः ॥ स नो ददातु तं रयिं रयिं[2] पिश-
ङ्गसंदृशम् । इन्द्रः पतिस्तुविष्टमो जनेष्वा ॥ सूददोहाः । शिरो
गायत्रमिन्द्रमिद्गाथिनो बृहदिति । अन्यासु चेत्समाम्नातासु
स्तुवीरन्नुभया[3] संस्थानविपर्ययोऽसमाम्नातासु चेत्स्तुवीरन्मि-
श्रासु च । सूक्तस्योत्तमा सूददोहाः । विजवः । सुतस्ते सोम

[8] अघ्यानाम् A अघ्नियानाम् F अघ्या३नाम् D (३ add sec man) अघ्यानाम् K L R S °ना३म् F G [9] अनू A [10] °मिषुध्यसोम् D F G K L S [11] समाम्नातवतीर् F [12] शसेह A [13] Numbered 5 in D [14] Text A R इति प्रथमोऽध्याय D पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय F G इति पचम आरण्ये प्रथमोऽध्याय K इति पचमारण्यके प्रथमोऽध्याय L no colophon E R accents quite irregularly the words of the first two sentences Cf V 2 2

[1] दाधृपाणा G दार्धषाण L [2] om F G [3] See explanatory notes

उर्प याहि यज्ञं मात्स्वा मदं पुरु वारं मघार्य । मंहिष्ठ इन्द्र विजरों[3] गृणध्यै ॥ स साहुर्तुवृत्रहत्येषु शत्रूनभुर्विगाह एषः । स नों[4] नेतारं महयाम इन्द्रम् ॥ इनो वसुः[5] समंजः पर्वतेष्ठाः प्रति वामृजीषी । इन्द्रः शर्वाविजोहूत एवैः ॥ सूददोहाः । इत्येतत्त्रयं ग्रीवाः शिरो विजवः सर्वमर्धर्चेम्[6] ॥१॥[7]

रायन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अभि त्वा शूर नोनुमोऽभि त्वा पूर्वपीतय इति रथन्तरस्य स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ चतस्रः सतीः षड्बृहतीः करोति । इन्द्रस्य नु वीर्याणि प्रवोचं त्वे ह यत्पितरश्चिन्न इन्द्रेति पञ्चदश यस्तिग्मशृङ्गो वृषभो न भीम उग्रो जज्ञे वीर्याय स्वधावानुदु ब्रह्माण्यैरत श्रवस्याते मह इन्द्रोऽत्युग्रेति पञ्च सूक्तानि । आ न इन्द्रो दूरादा न आसादिति संपातः । इत्था हि सोम इन्मद इति पङ्क्तिः । सूददोहाः । बार्हत उत्तरः । त्वामिद्धि हवामहे त्वं ह्येहि चेरव इति बृहतः स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ प्रगाथौ । चतस्रः[1] सतीः षड्बृहतीः करोति । तमु ष्टुहि यो अभिभूत्योजाः सुत इत्त्वं निमिश्ल इन्द्र सोम इति चीरयभूरेको रयिपते रयीणामित्यष्टौ सूक्तानि । कथा महामवृधत्कस्य होतुरिति संपातः । इन्द्रो मदाय वावृध इति पङ्क्तिः ।

[4] नोतार A  [5] वसु B in text and commentary, but the commentary clearly had वसुः.  [6] °मर्धर्चम् F, G  [7] Numbered 7 in A, E, K, L, 1, 7 in F, G, 1 in D  In B, besides several omitted accents, there occur बृहत्, धृषितं, ददातु, सुतस्, मंहिष्ठ, साहुर्तुवृत्रहत्येषु शत्रून्, एषः, पर्वतेष्ठाः, °जीषी. ग्रीवाः ३ has the pluti, as in V, 3, 1

[1] चस्र: F.

सूददोहाः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः पञ्चदशस्तोम[2] एकशतं वसिष्ठप्रासाहो बार्हत उत्तरः सप्तदशस्तोमो[2] द्विशतं भरद्वाजप्रासाहः । भद्रं पुछं द्विपदासु । इमा नु कं भुवना सीषधामा याहि वनसा सहेति नव समाम्नाताः । अथासमाम्नाताः ।

प्र व इन्द्राय वृत्रहन्तमाय विप्रा गाथं गायत यज्जुजोषत् ॥१॥
अर्चन्त्यर्कं देवताः स्वर्का आस्तोभति श्रुतो[4] युवा स इन्द्रः ॥२॥
उप प्रक्षे[5] मधुमति[6] क्षियन्तः[7] पुष्यन्तो रयिं धीमहे तमिन्द्र ॥३॥
विश्वतो दावन्विश्वतो न[8] आ भर यं त्वा शविष्ठमीमहे ॥४॥
स सुप्रणीति नृतमः स्वराळसि मंहिष्ठो वाजसातये ॥५॥
त्वं ह्येक ईशिषे सनादमृक्त ओजसा ॥६॥
विश्वस्य प्र स्तोभ विद्वान्पुरा वा यदि वेहास नूनम् ॥७॥
इयं नो मित्रावरुणा कर्तनेळां पीवरीमिषं कृणुही न इन्द्र ॥८॥
शं पदं मघं रयिषणि[10] न सोमो अव्रतं हिनोति न स्पृशद्रयिः ॥९॥

एष ब्रह्मेति तिस्रः आ धूर्ष्वस्मा इत्येका । सूददोहाः । यद्वावानेति धाय्या । सूददोहाः ॥२॥[11]

गायत्री तृचाशीतिः । महाँ इन्द्रो य ओजसेति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । पुरोळाशं नो अन्धस इति तिस्रः । इन्द्र इत्सोमपा

[2] ॰दशः in both cases S, ॰स्तोमो G [3] See explanatory notes [4] श्रुते G, see explanatory notes [5] उपप्रचे R, see explanatory notes [6] मति A [7] क्षयन्तः G [8] न om G [9] ॰नेर्पां F, G [10] रयीषणि F, G, R in commentary [11] Numbered 8 in A H K, L, 2, 8 in F, G, 2 in D. R has the following incorrect accents besides accenting प्रगाथो—प्रघोष, गायत, ॰तास्वर्का, स्तोभति श्रुतो, स्पृशद्रयिः, विश्वस्य.

एक इत्येतत्प्रभृतीनां तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । तासां स्वादवः सोमा आ याहीत्येतामुद्धृत्य न ह्यन्यं बळाकरमित्येतां प्रत्यवदधाति । जज्ञानो नु शतक्रतुरित्येका । पुरुहूतं पुरुष्टुतमिति शेषः । उद्वेदभि श्रुतामघमित्युत्तमामुद्धरति । प्र कृतान्यृजीषिण आ घा ये अग्निमिन्धत आ तू न इन्द्र क्षुमन्तमिति सूक्ते । सूददोहाः ॥३॥[1]

बार्हती तृचाशीतिः । मा चिदन्यद्वि शंसतेत्येकया न त्रिंशत् । पिबा सुतस्य रसिन इति विंशतेः[2] सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । यदिंद्र प्रागपागुदगिति चतुर्दश । वयं घ त्वा सुतावन्त इति पञ्चदश[4] । मो षु त्वा वाघतश्चनेत्येतस्य द्विपदां चोद्धरति[3] राथन्तरं च प्रगाथम् । अथ ह्यस्य न किः सुदासो रथमित्येतं प्रगाथमुद्धृत्य त्वामिदा ह्यो नर इत्येतं प्रगाथं प्रत्यवदधाति । अभि प्र वः सुराधसमिति पड्वालखिल्यानां सूक्तानि । यः सत्राहा विचर्षणिरिति शेषः । अयं ते अस्तु हर्यतः[5] इति सूक्ते । उभयं शृणवच्च न इति सप्तमीं चाष्टमीं चोद्धरति । तरोभिर्वो विदद्वसुमित्युत्तमामुद्धरति । यो राजा चर्षणीनामित्येकादश । तं वो दस्ममृतीषहमा नो विश्वासु हव्यो या इन्द्र भुज आभर इति नव । सूददोहाः ॥४॥[6]

. . .

[1] Numbered 9 in A, E, K, L; 2, 9 in Γ; 3, 9 in G; 3 in D.

[1] विश्रंसते इत्य् R in text; विश्रंसतेकया L. In a note to the commentary R gives एकोनत्रिंशत् as a variant. [2] विंशते L. [3] यदिन्द्र—०द्धरति bis G. [4] पंचद A. [5] अस्तुयंत F. [6] Numbered 10 in A, E, K, L; 4, 10 in Γ, G; 4 in D.

औष्णिही तृचाशीतिः । य इन्द्र सोमपातम इति सूक्ते । तम्वभि प्र गायतेत्युत्तमामुद्धरति[1] । इन्द्राय साम गायत सखाय आ शिषामहीति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । य एक इद्विदयत आ याह्यद्रिभिः सुतं यस्य त्यच्छम्बरं मद[2] इति त्रयस्तृचा गायत्र्यः संपदौष्णिहः सप्त सप्त गायत्र्यः षड्ककुष्णिहो भवन्ति । यदिन्द्राहं यथा त्वं प्र सम्राजं चर्षणीनामिति सूक्ते । उत्तरस्योत्तमे उद्धरति । वार्त्रहत्याय शवस इत्युत्तमामुद्धरति । सुरूपकृत्नुमूतय इति त्रीणि । एन्द्र सानसिं रयिमिति सूक्ते । य आनयत्परावत इति तिस्र उत्तमा उद्धरति । रेवतीर्नः सधमाद इति तिस्रः । सूददोहाः । इत्येतास्तिस्रस्तृचाशीतयः सर्वा अर्धर्च्याः[4] । अन्नमशीतयः । उदरं वशः । त्वावतः पुरूवसविति वशः । सनितः सुसनितरित्येतदन्तः । ददी रेक्ण इति द्विपदा । नूनमथेत्येकपदा । ता अस्य सूददोहस इत्येतदन्तः सूददोहाः सूददोहाः ॥५॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

[1] °मुद्धारति F. [2] मह K [3] R joins इति with सूददोहा, against the commentary and the sense [4] अर्धर्च्यौ G, अर्द्धर्चाः D pr man, corrected to °र्च्याः [5] Numbered 11 in A, F, K, L, 5, 11 in F, G, 5 in D [6] इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः A, इत्यैतरेयारण्यके पञ्चमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः R, पंचमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः F, G, इति पचम आरण्ये द्वितीयोऽध्यायः K, इति पचमारण्यके द्वितीयोऽध्यायः L; इति द्वितीय D, no colophon E

ADHYĀYA 3.

ऊरू[1]। इन्द्राग्नी युवं सु न इत्येतस्यार्धर्चान्गायत्रीकारमुत्तरमुत्तरस्यानुष्टुप्कारं प्रागुत्तमायाः। प्र वो महे मन्दमानायान्धस इति निविद्धानम्। वने न वा यो न्यधायि चाकन्यो जात एव प्रथमो मनस्वानिति ते अन्तरेण याह्यर्वाङुप वन्धुरेष्ठा विधुं दद्राणं समने बहूनामित्येतदावपनम्। दशतीनामैन्द्रीणां त्रिष्टुब्जगतीनां बृहतीसंपन्नानां यावतीरावपेरस्तावन्त्यूर्ध्वमायुषो वर्षाणि जिजीविषेत्संवत्सरात्संवत्सराद्दशतो न वा। त्यमू षु वाजिनं देवजूतम्। इन्द्रो विश्वं वि राजतीत्येकपदा। इन्द्रं विश्वा अवीवृधन्नित्यानुष्टुभम्। तस्य प्रथमायाः पूर्वमर्धर्चं शस्त्वोत्तरेणार्धर्चेनोत्तरस्याः पूर्वमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति पादैः पादानंनुष्टुप्कारम्। प्रागुत्तमायाः पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मादर्धर्चादुत्तरमुत्तरमर्धर्चं व्यतिषजति। प्रकृत्या शेषः। पिबा सोममिन्द्र मन्दतु त्वेति षट्। योनिष्ट इन्द्र सदने अकारीत्येतस्य चतस्रः शस्त्वोत्तमामुपसंतत्योपोत्तमया[4] परिदधाति। परिहित उक्थ[5] उक्थसंपदं जपति। उक्थवीर्यस्य स्थान उक्थदोहः ॥१॥[6]

[1] ऊरू३ R in text and in commentary. But Sāyana does not note the pluti, and probably it is incorrect. Neither S nor the MSS. have it. Cf. on V, 2, 1. [2] जिगीविषेत् G. [3] पादानुष्टुप् D pr. man., F, G; पादानानुष्टुप् D sec. man. [4] °पोत्तमाया F, G. [5] om. F, G. [6] Numbered 12 in A, E, K, L; 1, 12 in F, G; 1 in D.

मूर्धा लोकानामसि वाचो रसस्तेजः प्राणस्यायतनं मनसः ।
संवेशश्चक्षुषः संभवः श्रोत्रस्य प्रतिष्ठा हृदयस्य सर्वम् ॥१॥[1]
इन्द्रः कर्माक्षितममृतं व्योम ऋतं सत्यं विजिग्यानं विवाचनम् ।
अन्तो वाचो विभुः सर्वस्मादुत्तरं ज्योतिरूधरप्रतिवादः पूर्वम् ॥२॥
सर्वं वाक्परागर्वाक्सम्रु सलिलं धेनु पिन्वति चक्षुः श्रोत्रं प्राणः ।
सत्यसंमितं वाक्प्रभूतं मनसो विभूतं हृदयोग्रं ब्राह्मणभर्तृ-
क्रम्[2] ॥३॥
अन्नंशुभे वर्षपवित्रं गोभगं पृथिव्युपरं वरुणवाय्वितमम्[3] ।
तपस्तन्विन्द्रज्येष्ठं सहस्रधारमयुताक्षरममृतं दुहानम् ॥४॥
एतास्त उक्थ भूतय एता वाचो विभूतयः ।
ताभिर्म इह धुक्ष्वामृतस्य श्रियं महीम् ॥५॥
प्रजापतिरिदं ब्रह्म वेदानां ससृजे रसम् ।
तेनाहं विश्वमाप्यासं[4] सर्वान्कामान्दुहां महत् ॥६॥

भूर्भुवः स्वस्त्रयो वेदोऽसि । ब्रह्म प्रजां मे धुक्ष्व । आयुः प्राणं मे धुक्ष्व । पशून्विशं मे धुक्ष्व । श्रियं यशो मे धुक्ष्व । लोकं ब्रह्मवर्चसमभयं यज्ञसमृद्धिं मे धुक्ष्व । इति वाचयत्यध्वर्युमबुद्धं[5] चेदस्य भवति । ओमुक्थशा यज सोमस्येतीज्यायै संप्रेषितो येऽ३[6] यजामह इत्यागूर्य नित्ययैव यजति व्यवान्येवानु-

[1] The verses are divided as prose in the MSS, R and S, see explanatory notes
[2] °भर्तृम् S [3] °वय्व° A, K, S, in consequence, no doubt of the following : °वाय्वि° being written as °वय्वि° [4] विश्वमाप्यास A [5] °मबुद्द A, °मबुद्र (?) I
[6] ३ om S, but the use in the phrase is constant, and is laid down in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, I, 5 5

वषट्करोति । उक्तं वषट्कारानुमन्त्रणम् । आहरत्यध्वर्युरुक्थपात्रमतिग्राह्यांश्चमसांश्च[7] । भक्षं प्रतिख्याय होता प्राङ्खादवरोहति । अथैतं प्रेङ्खं प्रत्यञ्चमवबध्नन्ति यथा शंसितारं भक्षयिष्यन्तं नोपहनिष्यसीति । प्रेङ्खस्य ह्यायतन[8] आसीनो होता भक्षयति । अथैतदुक्थपात्रं होतोपसृष्टेन जपेन भक्षयति । वाग्देवी सोमस्य तृप्यतु । सोमो मे राजायुः प्राणाय वर्धतु । स मे प्राणः सर्वमायुर्दुहां महदिति । उत्तमादाभिप्लविकात्तृतीयसवनमन्यद्वैश्वदेवाग्निविज्ञानादस्य वामस्य पलितस्य होतुरिति सलिलस्य दैर्घतमस एकचत्वारिंशतमानोभद्रीयं[9] च तस्य स्थान ऐकाहिकौ वैश्वदेवस्य प्रतिपदनुचरौ । च्यवेत चेद्यज्ञायज्ञीयमग्ने तव श्रवो वय इति षट्स्तोत्रियानुरूपौ यदीळान्दं भूयसीषु चेत्स्तुवीरन्नाग्निं न स्ववृक्तिभिरिति तावतीरनुरूपः । संपन्नं महाव्रतं संतिष्ठत इदमहरग्निष्टोमो यथाकालमवभृथं प्रेङ्खं हरेयुः संदहेयुर्बृसीः ॥२॥[10]

[7] चमासं F. [8] °तनमासीनो S. [9] °मानोभद्रियं G

[10] Numbered 13 in A, E, K, L; 2, 13 in F, G; 2 in D

E omits accents, and R has the accents in many cases obviously wrong. In the case of the double accent of compounds, some of these may be correct; similar instances—some clearly wrong—occur, however, in the Kashmir MS of the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, as Scheftelowitz (p 39) points out. The chief cases are, v. 1, वाचौ, हृदयस्य सर्वं; v 2, इन्द्रः कर्मार्चितममृतं, वाचो; v. 3, सर्वं, पिन्वति, वाक्प्रभूतं, हृदयोत्थं, ब्राह्मणभर्तृकं; v. 4, सर्वपवित्रं, पृथिव्युपरं, तपस्तन्विन्द्रज्येष्ठ, °मयुताचरम्; v 6, वेदानां सस्त्रजे, तेनाहं विश्वमाप्यासं सर्वान्कामान्दुहां; v. 7, स्वस् and ब्रह्मवर्चसं. त्विषिं मे and यशो मे are conceivable but improbable.

नादीक्षितो महाव्रतं शंसेन्नानग्नौ न परस्मै नासंवत्सरं इत्येके कामं पित्रे वाचार्याय वा शंसेदात्मनो हैवास्य तच्छस्तं भवति । होतृशस्त्रेपूक्यशा[1] यज सोमस्येत्येकः प्रैषः संनाराशंसेष्वनाराशंसेषु वा होत्रकाणाम् । [उक्यशा[2] यज सोमानामिति ।] तदिदमहर्नानन्तेवासिने प्रब्रूयान्नासंवत्सरवासिने नो एवासंवत्सरवासिने नाब्रह्मचारिणे नासब्रह्मचारिणे नो एवासब्रह्मचारिणे नानभिप्राप्यैतं देशम् । न भूयः सकृन्नदनाद्विर्गदनाद्वा इत्येव । एक एकस्मै प्रब्रूयादिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः । न वत्से च न तृतीय इति । न तिष्ठंस्तिष्ठते न व्रजन्व्रजते न शयानः शयानाय नोपर्यासीन उपर्यासीनायाथ एवासीनोऽथ आसीनाय । नावष्टब्धो न प्रतिस्तब्धो नातिवीतो नाङ्कं कृत्वोर्ध्वजुरनपश्रितोऽधीयीत न मांसं भुक्त्वा न लोहितं दृष्ट्वा न गतासुं नावत्यमाक्रम्य नाक्त्वा नाभ्यज्य नोन्मर्दनं कारयित्वा न नापितेन कारयित्वा न स्नात्वा न वर्णकेनानुलिप्य न स्रजमपिनह्य न स्त्रियमुपगम्य नोल्लिख्य नाविलिख्य । नेदमेकस्मिन्नहनि समापयेदिति ह स्माह जातूकर्ण्यः समापयेदिति गालवो यदन्यत्प्राकृचाशीतिभ्यः समापयेदेवेत्याग्निवेश्यायनोऽन्यमन्यस्मिन्देशे शमयमान इति । यच्चेदमधीयीत न तत्रान्यदधीयीत यत्र त्वन्यदधीयीत काममिदं तत्राधीयीत । नेदमनधीयन्स्नातको भवति यद्यप्यन्यद्बह्वधीयान्नैवेदमनधीयन्स्नातको भवति । ना-

[1] This sentence is of doubtful authenticity, see explanatory notes [2] स ना॰ S.

[2] This occurs in all the MSS. of the text, but was clearly not read by Sāyaṇa, and occurs in none of the MSS of Sāyaṇa

स्मादधीतात्प्रमाद्येद्यद्यप्यन्यस्मात्प्रमाद्येन्नैवास्मात्प्रमाद्येन्नो एवास्मात्प्रमाद्येत् । अस्माच्चेन्न प्रमाद्येदलमात्मन इति विद्यात् । अलं सत्यं विद्यात् । नेदंविदनिदंविदा समुद्दिशेन्न सह भुञ्जीत न सधमादी स्यात् [ अथातः स्वाध्यायधर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः । उप पुराणेनापीते कक्षोदके पूर्वाह्णे न संभिन्नासु छायास्वपराह्णे नाध्यूळ्ह मेघेऽपर्तौ वर्षे त्रिरात्रं वैदिकेनाध्यायेनान्तरियान्नास्मिन्कथां वदेत नास्य रात्रौ चन चिकीर्तयिषेत्[4] । तदिति वा एतस्य महतो भूतस्य नाम भवति योऽस्यैतदेवं नाम वेद ब्रह्म भवति ब्रह्म भवति ॥ ३ ॥[5]

॥ इत्यैतरेयपञ्चमारण्यके तृतीयोऽध्यायः ॥[6]

॥ इति पञ्चमारण्यकं समाप्तम् ॥[7]

[4] So I conjecture· च कीर्तयिषेत् all MSS. and edd. [5] Numbered 14 in A, E, K, L; 3, 14 in F, G; not numbered in D. [6] Text, A, R; तृतीयोऽध्यायः प्रथमारण्यकमारभ्यं (मारभ्य G) पंचमारण्यकपर्यंतं । अष्टादशोऽध्यायः । औं (om. G) इति आश्वलायनोक्तमारण्यकं नाम समाप्तं । F, G; इति पंचम आरण्ये तृतीयोऽध्यायः । समाप्तं । K; इति पंचयारण्यके । तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पंचमारण्यकं समाप्तं । L; इति तृतीयोऽध्यायः । इति पंचमारण्यः । समाप्तः । D E has २४ हरिः ओं । अग्निर्वै देवानामवमो विष्णुः परमः (the beginning of the Aitareya Brāhmana, which presumably once in this MS followed the Āranyaka) । नादीक्षितो महाव्रतं शंसेत् । मूर्धा लोकानामसि । ऊरू इन्द्राग्नी ध्रुवं सु न इति । औष्णिही तृचाशीतिः । बार्हती तृचाशीतिः । गायत्री तृचाशीतिः । राथन्तरो दक्षिणः पक्षः । ग्रीवाः यस्येदमारजः । तदिदास भुवनेषु ज्येष्ठं तं सु ते कीर्तिं मघवन्महित्वा । प्रस्तोतारं संख्याति । निधिते प्रेङ्खे होता । यथैतं सद्‍ः प्रसर्पति । उपाहते स्तोत्रे । महाव्रतस्य पञ्चविंशतिं सामिधेन्यः । महाव्रतस्य षट् । ग्रीवाः सप्त । ऊरू त्रयः । महाव्रतस्य औष्णिही चत्वारि । इति पञ्चमारण्यं समाप्तम् । आरण्यपञ्चकस्य समाप्तम् । हरिः ओम् । See also the note on I, 1, 1. K sums up

the number of khandas thus, खड ३५ म २२ द्वि २६ तृ १२ च १ प १४ । [7] At the end of the Āraṇyaka S adds a second set of Sānti Mantras, see on I, 1, 1 Similarly in the Ānandāsrama edition, 1895, of thirty two Upanisads there is prefixed to the Kausitaki Upanisad, and also appended to it, a set of Sānti Mantras, similar to those in Aitareya Āranyaka, II, 7, and Sāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 1.

# AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA

## TRANSLATION AND NOTES

## ĀRAṆYAKA I

### ADHYĀYA 1.

Now begins the Mahāvrata[1] rite. Indra having slain Vṛtra became great. When he became great, then there came into being the Mahāvrata. Therefore the Mahāvrata ceremony bears the name of Mahāvrata. Some[2] say the priest should make two recitations with the ghee-offering for that day, but the established rule is one. He who desires prosperity should use the hymn, 'To Agni, to this god of yours, (I sing aloud)' (RV., III, 13) He who desires increase should use the hymn, 'The guest of all your folk' (RV, VIII, 74). For the folk indeed are increase and therefore he gains increase.[3] Some say that one should not use that

[1] The term *mahāvrata* is, Sāyana points out, explained by the Taittirīya school in three ways, either *mahān bhavaty anena vratena* or *mahato devasya vratam* or *mahat ca tad vratam*. The Chandogas give the latter two explanations. See Taittirīya Brāhmana, I, 2, 6, 1, and Sāyana, ad loc For the whole, cf. Aitareya Brāhmana, III, 21, 1; Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 5, 5, 3; Śatapatha Brāhmana, X, 4, 1, 21, 22; *Pet. Lex*, s.v.

[2] The two Ājyas recommended are RV, VIII, 74 and VII, 1; the reference is to the view of the Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 2. The former is the *prākṛta* because it is an Ājya Śastra in the Agniṣṭoma, the latter the *vaikṛta* because it is an Ājya Śastra in the Viśvajit (see Kausītaki Brāhmana, XXV, 11) The Aitareya holds that only the *vaikṛta*, VII, 1, should be employed, according to Sāyana because the Agniṣṭoma which is the *prakṛti* has twelve Śastras, and if there were two Ājya Śastras the Mahāvrata would have thirteen VII, 1, which is the Ājya Śastra, is also at the same time a *kāmya ājyaśastra* used by those who desire proper food (see I, 1, 2)

[3] This is the rendering adopted by Max Muller from Sāyana, who explains that Vaiśyas making large earnings offer much taxation (*karam api bahulam prayacchanti*, which Max Müller takes as 'increase their capital', but this is in view of *prayacchanti* (Sāyana on Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 29) hardly possible) Perhaps it would be possible to translate · 'For he (Agni) is the increase of the folk and so he (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous,' but it is probable that the commentator has preserved the correct rendering, though of course in the original the *viśo viśo* is in the genitive. For taxation, cf Fick, *Die sociale Gliederung*, pp 79, 80; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p 48; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, II, 10, 26, 9, &c Already in the RV., I, 65, 7 (see Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XLVI, 56, and Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, xvi) the king devours the rich. In a series of passages (XI, 5, 7, 1; XIII, 5, 4, 24; XIII, 1, 8, 4; V, 4, 2, 3) in the Śatapatha Brāhmana, cited by Winternitz (*Gesch. der indisch. Litt*, I, 173, 174) the king receives the people, save only the Brahmins, as his food, because they pay him taxes. So often in the epic the exactions of kings are mentioned, cf Hopkins, *India Old and New*, pp 240, 243, n. 3; Keith, *Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka*, p 68.

hymn because there is in it the word 'guest', and a guest is liable to go begging.[1] But (Mahidasa[2]) said that one should use that hymn. For he who becomes good and attains excellence,[3] is indeed a guest. For, him who is not so, men do not deem worthy of hospitality. Therefore one may by all means use that hymn. If he does use it, he should place first the tristich 'To him, best Vrtra slayer, are we come' (RV, VIII, 74, 4–6). For eager for this day they worship the whole year,

[1] Sāyana renders 'He who uses that hymn becoming poor has to go begging in other people's houses', which is clearly wrong. For the construction (II 3 5) cf. Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp. 420 sq; Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 217; Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 984. The word *īśvara* in this sense becomes sometimes stereotyped in form, cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā III 1 1 3 (cited by Weber *Ind. Stud.* XIII 112) with Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XII 5 8. It is a construction peculiarly common in the Brāhmaṇas and disappears later.

It will be seen that in the text throughout *padam bharati* and so forth have been printed *m* being in every case when final save at the end of a sentence altered to *anusvāra*, and further in all cases where *m* occurs as the end of the first member of a compound (e g *sam*°) ṃ is used. It is clear that, in a text of the Brāhmaṇa period before mutes generally the appropriate nasal should be used, before *y l v* either *anusvāra* or those semivowels nasalized, and before *r ś ṣ s h* *anusvāra* with *m* in pausā (see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* §§ 212, 213, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 333, 334, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* pp. 63, 68) but this course merely adds to the unnecessary difficulties of the Devanāgarī script (the continual use of which is an unfortunate necessity) and I have followed most editors, including Prof Macdonell in his *Bṛhaddevatā*, in using *anusvāra* before mutes, semivowels and sibilants, as allowed by Pāṇini VIII 4 59 and approved by Whitney §§ 71, 73. The practice of writing *m* before labials while using *anusvāra* before the other mutes is convenient but illogical, and has not been followed. I have also written *ch* for *c ch* of the MSS (with many exceptions) except where *c ch* represents an assimilated letter + *ch*. It is no doubt the case that *ch* in Sanskrit is rarely, if ever (Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 154 allows *puccha* as representing *k̂h*, but Dr Scheftelowitz rejects the view), a representation of any save a conjunct consonant in Indo-Germanic (either *s + k̂h* or (as Dr Scheftelowitz in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* tries to prove) *s + k̂* normally). But there is no proof that *c ch* represents this more properly than *ch* (the fact of position is of no importance), and the use of *c ch* for the simple letter prevents any distinction between e g *t + ch* and *ch* alone. For this reason I follow Aufrecht (in his *Ṛgveda*), Bloomfield, v. Schroeder, Knauer (see his *Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra* pp. xxx, xxxv with all his MSS), Macdonell, and others in writing *ch* for the simple letter. Lévi, Whitney's and Lanman's use (in the *Translation of the Atharvaveda*) of *ch* even for *t + ch* (for *t*) is the opposite extreme (cf Prof Macdonell *J R A S*, 190 , p. 1101).

[2] The text has only 'He said.' Sāyana explains by *ata eva kaścid ṛṣir āha*. Clearly it must be Mahidāsa Aitareya. Cf II 3 1 n 4; III 2 6 n 13.

[3] It is not obvious how *atithi* is thus interpreted. Sāyana interprets *bhavati* as *samṛddho bhavati*. Max Müller says one would expect *yo 'tti* ... (cf Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p. 126, but see Hopkins *A J P* XIV 22) and suggests that the obtaining of excellence is probably derived from *ati* above in *atithi*. Another explanation seems possible: *ithi* in the Brāhmaṇas has in composition the sense 'obtain' (cf Sāyana's rendering—*ithim prāptavān*—of Aitareya Brāhmaṇa III 23 3), *√at* according to the lexicographers has the same sense, so that here *yo 'tithi bhavati* is perhaps explained by *yaḥ śreṣṭhatām aśnute*. *Ātman* below is already found in Mantra, cf Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* pp. 184 sq. For the duty of hospitality cf Taittirīya Upaniṣad III 10.

and now they draw nigh to it The next three tristichs[7] begin with *anustubh* verses. Now the *gāyatrī* verse is *brahman*,[8] the *anustubh* is Vāc, and so he unites Vāc and *brahman* He who desires glory should use the hymn, 'Agni is aroused by the fuel of the folk' (RV., V, 1). He who desires children[9] and cattle should use the hymn,[10] 'The wise sacrificer has been born' (RV., II, 5)[11]

[7] The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 2, ignores vv 13–15 of RV, VIII, 74, which form a *dana stuti* of Śrutarvan Ārksya. The reference here shows clearly that the Aitareya takes the same view of these verses Verses 8, 9, 11, 12 are in *gayatri*, 14, 15 in *anustubh* ?

[8] Sayana gives as reasons for these identifications that the *parabrahma* is set forth by means of the *gayatri* (RV, III, 62, 10), and that, like this *anustubh*, Vāc has four forms (RV, I, 164, 45, Nirukta, XIII, 9, &c. *Z D M G*, XXXIX, 58), (*para pašyanti madhyama vaikhari* later, see *J. A O S*, XXII, 69, Mallināthа on Kumarasambhava, II, 17) There is no reason to suppose that the identification of Vāc and *anustubh* and *gayatri* and *brahman* has any basis beyond mere fancy, for different identifications, cf *J. A. O. S.*, XVI, 359 The original sense of *brahman* (so throughout to contrast with Brahman, the god) must clearly have been prayer or spell (cf II, 3, 8), the two ideas blending indefinitely since the prayer could be regarded as a spell and vice versa (Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p 315) Deussen's view of *brahman* (*Allg Gesch der Phil*, I, 1, 241 sq) as 'der zum Heiligen, Gottlichen emporstrebende Wille des Menschen' is quite untenable, see Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 211, 212 That Vac is *brahman* was the doctrine of Jitvan Śailini and it is set forth by Yajñavalkya, Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 1, 2, and the identification is developed in the late Logos doctrine Cf also Tandya Mahābrahmana, XX, 14, 2, Chāndogya Upanisad, VII, 2, 1, Hopkins, *India Old and New* p 147, n 1, with whose view of the slight importance of the Logos doctrine in this form I agree

[9] Sayana concludes his commentary on this Khanda by explaining that, though by the *godohananyāya* (cf for another *nyaya* on this, Mimāmsa Sutra, IV, 3, 10) the *kamyasuktas* are intended primarily for the gaining of desired results, nevertheless they make up the sacrifice and do not leave it imperfect, on the principle *kamyena nityasiddhih* This *nyaya* arises, he explains, from the rule on the new and full moon sacrifice *camasenapah pranayed godohanena pašukamasya*, where as the sacrifice can be carried out *camasena* the *godohanena* is merely *purusarthatvam* (see Jacob, *Maxims*, 3rd series)

[10] In the references in the translation to the RV, where no line is mentioned, it is to be understood that the whole hymn as accepted by the Āranyaka is meant When only special verses are meant their numbers are given

[11] For the Śanti verses and their authenticity see Crit Note The verse in S *šatadharam* is RV, III, 26, 9, *avadams*, II, 43, 3, *rtam Agne*, VIII, 11, 1, *bhadram*, X, 20, 1, *šam no Mitrah*, I, 90, 9 *šiva* occurs in Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 1, cf I 21, 31, as *šivā nah šántamā bhavantu* | *divyā́ ā́pa ósadhayah* | *sumrḍīkā́ Sarasvati* (so accented in the Anandašrama ed ), and as here in that Āranyaka, IV, 42, Latyayana Śrauta Sutra, V 3, 2 (with *v l samdašas*) The Atharvaveda, VII, 68, 3, has in the last *pada*, *mā́ te yuyoma samdršas* 'may we not be separated from thy sight', which explains the origin of the quite unintelligible *vyoma*[a] The verse *tac caksur* occurs also in Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 42 where will be found RV, IV, 31, 1–3 For *osthapi°*, cf III, 2, 5, n

In the Śānkhayana Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 4 and 5, verses are given to accompany the recitation of the Samhitas (Śankhayana Aranyaka, VII, VIII), and the formulae are placed at the beginning

[a] Cf also v Schroeder, *Die Tubinger Katha Handschriften*, p 115, and the Śanti prefixed to the Kausitaki Upanisad in the Ānandašrama ed

2 He who desires proper food[1] should use the hymn, 'Agni men kindle from the twigs with splendour' (RV, VII, 1)[2] For Agni is the eater of food In the other chants accompanying the ghee offerings men approach as it were more slowly to Agni, but here they come upon Agni at the very beginning, at the very beginning he[3] obtains proper food, at the very beginning they smite away

of the text in the Āraṇyaka thus *ṛtam vadiṣyami satyam vadiṣyami* | *adabdham mana isiram cakṣuḥ* | *suryo jyotiṣam śreṣṭho* | *dikṣe ma ma hiṃsiḥ* | Other verses are prescribed to precede *adabdham*, &c., in the case of the Śakvaris and of the Mahavrata the Mantha (Sankhayana Aranyaka, IX), &c. In Khaṇḍa 5 are given the expiatory formulae *ud tak śukriyam dadhe* | *tad aham atmani dadhe* | and then other differing formulae (see Oldenberg's ed pp. 163 sq, and *S B E*, XXIX, 145 sq) Oldenberg renders *ud taḥ*, &c., as 'From here I take out the brightness (?)', but I would much rather take *uditaḥ* (and the version in the Anandaśrama ed., p. 295 accents *uditaḥ*) as 'He, arisen gives forth brightness. That (brightness) I appropriate to myself', referring to the beneficial and purifying effects of the radiance of the sun (cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 31) Oldenberg also takes *suryo*, &c., as predicate to *adabdham*, &c., which is hardly necessary The phrase *sarvaḥ*, &c, probably means 'I arise whole (possibly with a suggestion of *salvus* i e complete, perfect healthy) with breath, with strength, may prosperity attend me, may the gods attend me.' The assertion *uttiṣṭhami*, may be based on the magic principle exhibited in faith cures. The other clauses offer no difficulty, but *bhumim*, &c. is obscure *iḍa* (unaccented in R) may be nom. to *upaspṛśed*, *namaḥ* being interjected, but this is very unlikely, as *agne iḍa* occurs alone (see Crit Note) It may be, 'Honour (to thee), O Agni, and oblation, but this is merely possible

In the Manava Śrauta Sutra, II, 1, 2, 36 (cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* pp 40[a], 454[a]) occurs *adabdham cakṣur ariṣṭam manaḥ suryo jyotiṣam śreṣṭhaḥ dikṣe ma mā hasit satapa*, which illustrates the position here of *cakṣuḥ* In Taittiriya Saṃhita, III 1, 1, 2 *dikṣe ma ma hasiḥ* occurs The exact words used here are found in Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, VII, 1, IX, 1

[1] Sayana explains *annadya* as a compound of *anna* and *adya* Max Muller follows this view, cf Monier Williams *Dict* s.v *adya* But it is surely preferable all through to take it as an abstract of *annada*, an eater of food, with the sense 'eating of food' which passes into the idea 'food', or 'proper food, as *annada* has the force of 'a healthy man' For the formation see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1212 Oertel on Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, II, 11, 10, renders 'food eating'

[2] Sayana points out that the hymn is both a *nitya* and a *kāmya* hymn It is hardly correct to say, as Max Muller does that it is an obligatory part of the sacrifice, since as we have seen in I 1, 1, the *kāmyasuktāni* are sufficient to complete the ceremony What Sayana means is that it is both the normal form and also a form for a special purpose. He compares the use of *dadhi* in the Agnihotra both as normal and where strength is desired, and the use of *khādira* in the Agniṣomiyapaśu rite as normal and when might is wished The possible forms then are (1) this hymn as normal, (2) this hymn as *annadyakāma* (3) any of the other *kāmyasuktāni* enumerated in I, 1, 1 In RV, VIII, 1, vv 1-18 are in *virāj* metre, the rest in *triṣṭubh*, which explains the reference to these metres below

[3] The distinction between 'he' and 'they' is no doubt deliberate 'He' corresponds to *annadyakāmaḥ* and 'they' to *agachanti* Sāyana explains the singular by *yajamānasaṅghaḥ*, but this is unnecessary Max Müller renders 'he' in each case R reads *sadyaḥ*, which is a correction probably of his own, for the *samyak* of most of the MSS. including S[1]S[2]S[3], but is of course most unfortunate *Iva* is almost equivalent to *eva*, cf. Delbrück, *Altindische*

evil Because of the words (RV., VII, 1, 1b), 'with moving of the arms they bring to birth[4] Agni,' the hymn has the word 'birth' in it Verily the sacrificer is born from this day, and so the hymn has the word 'birth' There are four verses (in the *tristubh*), cattle are four-footed, the verses serve to win cattle. There are three verses (in the *viraj*), these are the threefold worlds, the verses serve to gain these worlds. These two verses form a support. Man has a double support, cattle have four feet The hymn places the sacrificer with his double support among the four footed cattle.[5] The verses if said straight on number twenty-five. Man consists of twenty-five elements He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty-fifth By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth Further, this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn[6] of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like So the two are[7] twenty-five. By repeating the first three, and the last three, the verses

*Syntax*, p. 477, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 230, and Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p 79 who calls this use late, hardly correctly Cf III, 2, 6, II 1, 2, 6, 1, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, p 430 I think that *iva* must originally—or at any rate quite early—have had a sense approaching more or less to *eva* Cf RV, I, 145, 3 *tám it prchanti ná simó ví prchati svéneva dhíro mánasā yád ágrabhīt* The sense is hardly 'by his own mind alone', as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 164) takes it The phrase is softened by *iva*, just as metaphorical phrases are softened by *quasi*, &c. in Latin (Berger, *Stylistique Latine*[3] p 140) This sense appears clearly in III, 2, 6 *vagbrahmanani ivopadiharati* This avoids amendment to *eva* as proposed for the RV passage by Oldenberg So in RV, IV, 5, 8 *var iva* See also Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 375, n 3, on Śatapatha Brahmana, X, 5, 3, 1, 'Sayana seems to take "iva" here in the sense of "eva", as indeed it often has to be taken, especially in negative sentences.' The real sense is clearly seen in phrases like *prataram iva kriyante*, Aitareya Brahmana, III, 48, 4 See also n. 5 on II, 1, 2 So in Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 2, 2, for the Kanva text *eva*, the Madhyandina has *iva* explained as *eva* by the commentator (Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, 159, n 3), ibid, III, 9, 28 5, for the Kanva *iva vai*, the Madhyandina has *u vai* (*S B E*, XV, 150, n 5) This use is not found in independent passages of the Śankhayana Aranyaka, where in VIII, 10, *eva* takes the place of *iva* in Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6 Cf also Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, LXI, 824 sq

[4] Sayana is probably correct in taking *janayanta* in a timeless or present sense Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, Avery, *J A O S*, XI, 326–361

[5] The hymn has two metres and in one of these metres four feet, man has two and cattle four feet, and the union in the hymn produces union in reality *catuspatsu* occurs also in Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 2, 7, where the whole phrase occurs with °*padah* For *catuspadah pasavah* cf Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 2, 20, and often in the Gopatha Brahmana The whole phrase is also identical with Aitareya Brahmana, III, 31, 13, &c

[6] For this see I, 1, 4, II, 3, 4, Śānkhayana Aranyaka, I, 1 The reference is to the *pañcavimśa stoma* in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktha

[7] The plural is explained by Sayana as due to the *rcs* being thought of and not the hymn, but here the 'attraction' of the predicate is an adequate explanation, since such examples of carelessness are very rare Cf, however, RV, III, 6, 3, where Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 24, 6) refers *yajñiyasah* to Heaven and Earth, RV, II, 5, 6 (ibid, 204), RV, VII, 93, 7, *yát sim ágaś cakṛmá tát sú mṛḷa tád aryamáditih śiśrathantu* | where Agni and perhaps the other

become thirty less one, that is equivalent to a *viraj* verse minus one syllable For in the small (womb) seed is deposited,[8] in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed So (the *viraj* small by one) serves for the obtainment of these desires He who knows this obtains those desires The verses include also the *bṛhatī* metre[9] and the *viraj* metre, and the perfection of that day They also include the *anuṣṭubh* metre,[10] for the chants accompanying the ghee offerings depend on *anuṣṭubhs*[11]

3 'The Praüga[1] should be in the *gāyatrī* metre,' some say,[2] 'for the *gāyatrī* is brightness and splendour and thus (the sacrificer) becomes bright and splendid.' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *uṣṇih* metre, for the *uṣṇih* is life

Adityas are in the mind of the poet Ibid, X, 85 47 (altered in Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sutra, I 8, 9), *hṛdayani* is used of a man and wife In Maitrayaniya Samhita, I, 5, 12, *srjavahas* is used of the gods cf *bravivahas* in IV, 1, *infra* Cf too the verse cited V, 2, 2 *isam no Mitravaruna kartanelam* and Atharvaveda XIV, 1, 39, with Whitney's note Cf. Delbruck *Altindische Syntax*, p 102, Speyer, *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 26 n, Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXIX, 62, n 1

[8] See I, 3 7 where this recurs.

[9] The verses taken together make up eighteen *viraj* verses (it is not necessary to assume the repetition of the first *viraj* thrice as does Max Muller), and seven *triṣṭubh* verses Repeating thrice the last *triṣṭubh*, and taking away eight syllables from each verse, we reach nine *bṛhatī* verses plus nine sets of eight syllables which taken all together give two *bṛhatī* verses. Cf. Śankhayana Āranyaka, I, 2

[10] The first verse, though called *viraj* in the Anukramanī, is really a verse of thirty three syllables and by the doctrine that one or two syllables make no difference, it can easily be regarded as an *anuṣṭubh* of thirty two syllables The acc is due to the force of *abhi*, cf *jantvām abhi sāmbabhutha*, RV, X 18 8 as explained by Whitney, *A J P*, XIII, 297 and Geldner *Vedische Studien* II 306 Later √*bhu* governs the acc., see Hopkins *Great Epic of India* pp 265, 473 For the exact sense of *abhi* cf *abhi samcinuti*, Śatapatha Brahmana, X, 2, 4 1 with Eggeling's note, Aitareya Brahmana III 22 6 *virajam dašini abhisampadyetam*, and elsewhere in the Brahmana and Sūtra literature

[11] Ājya here, as above must mean Ājya Śastra as Sayana takes it. The reference is to RV, III, 13 which is an *anuṣṭubh* hymn and is the Ājya Śastra of the Agniṣṭoma

[1] After the eating of the *ṛtugrahas* and the recitation of the Ājya Śastra comes the *Vaiśvadevagraha* and the Praüga In the *prakṛti* the Agniṣṭoma the Praüga consists of seven *tṛcas*, comprising RV I 2, and 3 ascribed to the poet Madhuchandas, so in Kausītaki Brahmana, XV 5 The Aitareya Āranyaka keeps these *tṛcas* for the Praüga, in the Śankhāyana there is used a set apparently of seven *tṛcas* (RV, VII, 91, 1–3 4–6, VII 61, 1–3, IV, 43 1–3, IV, 23 1–3, IV, 55 1–3 VII, 95, 4–6), in the *triṣṭubh* metre, ascribed to Vāmadeva *chatrrunnyayena* though only three are his (Govinda on Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVII 8, 10) The series of deities, Vāyu, Indra Vāyu Mitra Varuna Aśvinau Indra, Viśvedevaḥ Sarasvatī is the same as in the original *tṛcas* of RV, I 2, 3 There can be no doubt that the Śāṅkhāyana version is the later The order of the *grahas* is different in Kātyāyana Śrauta Sutra, IX, 13, 33 For the metres and their relation to the *savanas* see Bergaigne *Journal Asiatique*, XIII, 166 sq, Bloomfield *J A O S.*, XVI, 4 sq, Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 301

[2] The *traiṣṭubha* Praüga is preferred in the Śāṅkhayana, but nothing is there said as to the reason here given, while arguments for the *gayatrī* are there mentioned, which here are not used This adds another reason for regarding the Śāṅkhāyana as the later version

and so (the sacrificer) wins life' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *anuṣṭubh* metre, for the *anuṣṭubh* is valour, and so it serves to obtain valour' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *bṛhatī*, for the *bṛhatī* is prosperity, and so (the sacrificer) becomes prosperous' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *paṅkti* metre, for the *paṅkti* is food and so (the sacrificer) wins food' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *triṣṭubh* metre, for the *triṣṭubh* is strength and so (the sacrificer) becomes strong' Others say, 'The Praüga should be in the *jagatī* metre, for cattle[3] are like the *jagatī* and so (the sacrificer) acquires cattle' But (the sacrificer) should take a *gāyatrī* hymn only For the *gāyatrī* is *brahman*,[4] and that day is *brahman*, and so through *brahman* is *brahman* commenced[5] The hymn should be one by Madhuchandas For Madhuchandas desires[6] honey for the singers and so he is called Madhuchandas Now food truly is honey, all is honey, all desires are honey, therefore if one recite the hymn of Madhuchandas, it serves to obtain all desires He who knows this obtains all desires Now this Praüga in the one day form[7] is perfect[8] Much indeed on that day is done that is forbidden[9] and (the Praüga) is the atonement[10] Now atonement

[3] Cf I, 1, 2, n 5 *The point of resemblance is the number of feet* See Taittirīya Saṃhita, III, 2, 9 4, VI, 1 6, 2, Aitareya Brahmana, I, 21 15, 28, 11 Elsewhere the *gāyatrī* is connected with *aṣṭāśaphāḥ paśavaḥ*, Jaiminiya Brahmana, III, 241, Tandya Mahabrahmana, III, 8, 2, or *paśavaḥ* are *pāṅktāḥ*, Aitareya Brahmana, III, 23 5

[4] Cf I, 1, 1 ad fin

[5] The day is *brahman* because it causes men to attain *brahman* This passage appears to be quoted or referred to in Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, I, 2 *brahma va ekaha* (?) *brahmaitad ahar brahmanaiva tad brahma samardhayati* See I, 2, 2, *infra*

[6] Sayana so takes *chandati* The compound may rather have meant 'praising honey', as the Naighaṇṭuka III, 14 gives *chandati* as an equivalent of *arcati* and cf also RV, VI, 11, 3 when *chanda* occurs, or possibly 'winning honey', cf Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 146, n 3) who takes the meaning of √*chand* as 'gefallen, befriedigen, oder befallen machen'. Cf also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 154 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 31, n. 3, Weber, *Ind Stud*, VIII, 4 sq, as to the connexion of *chandas* with *skandati*, which if real would be natural as giving a basis for the meaning of *chandas* as right time (cf. *pes*, 'foot,' 'scansion,' &c) √*chand* and √*chad* 'cover' are not separated by the Indian grammarians, but are of very doubtful connexion (Whitney, *Roots, &c* pp. 49 50, Ryder, *J A O S*, XVIII, 77, Weber, *Ind Stud* XVII, 236) Madhuchandas appears in Kauṣītaki Brahmana, XXVIII, 2, Aitareya Brahmana, VII 17, Bṛhaddevata, II, 126, III, 57, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, &c. For *tad yad*, &c, cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 575

[7] The Agnistoma, which is the *prakṛti* of the Viṣuvat and that of the Mahāvrata, is a one day sacrifice Cf Sabbathier, *Agnistoma*, Caland and Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*

[8] Because, Sāyana says it can easily be performed by remembering the Agnistoma, which it exactly follows This passage is repeated in I, 2, 1, &c.

[9] Max Muller renders 'to be hidden' Sayana says [illegible] The reference is clearly to the [illegible] (so R, S has what is better [illegible]), see [illegible], i.e. the popular part of the old ritual

[10] This is perhaps better than Max Müller's 'and has to be [illegible] (by recitation)'.

is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Praūga)[11] as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotṛ priest, who knows this, recites this Praūga.

4 (There is the word 'ready' in the verse,) 'Come hither, O Vāyu, conspicuous, these Soma draughts have been made ready' (RV., I, 2, 1), this day indeed is ready for the sacrificer and for the gods. Truly the day is ready for him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites In the verse, 'Indra and Vayu, these draughts are poured forth, come to what is prepared' (RV, I, 2, 4) by 'prepared' (*niskrta*) he denotes what is 'well prepared' (*samskrta*)[1] Indra and Vayu approach what has been well prepared by him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites In the verse, 'Mitra of holy might I summon (and Varuna) who make perfect[2] the oil fed rite' (RV, I, 2, 7[a]), speech is the oil fed rite Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites In the verse 'Aśvins (accept) the sacrificial offerings' (RV, I, 3, 1[a]), the sacrificial offerings are food and this serves to gain food The Aśvins go to the sacrifice of him who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites the verse, 'Come hither, ye whose path is red'[3] (RV, I, 3 3) In the verses, 'Indra of bright splendour, come hither, Indra impelled by prayer, come hither, Indra hastening, come hither' (RV, I, 3 5[a], 6[a], 4[a]), he recites, 'Come hither, come hither' Indra goes to his sacrifice who knows this or for whom a Hotṛ priest who knows this recites The All-gods come to the call of him who knows,

It is a curious inversion of ideas by which the old popular rites retained no doubt reluctantly in the ritual become regarded as improper and needing atonement.

[11] Max Muller takes *pratisthāikāhah* as separate from *śantyam* but suggests that *ekāhah* may go with *śantyām* This certainly seems better, as it avoids the identification of *ekāhah* and *śantih* 'At the end' refers to the fact that the Mahavrata is the last day but one of the Sattra For *pratisthā* as a medical term see Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907, p 14

[1] From *niskrta* comes the Vedic *iskrti* according to Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, xxvi For *samskrta* as 'well cooked', see Thomas, *J R A S*, 1904 p 748, Kirste, *J R A S*, 1905, p 353 For *is* and *√id* cf. Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 2 4. For *aram* above, which as against *alam*, V, 2 3, is a sign of early date, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 211 sq, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp 43 sq *alam* already appears in the Atharvaveda. The syntax is normal, see Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* pp. 146 147 Sayana, probably correctly, explains that the hymn has the word *aram* because the day is *aram*, not vice versa. The use of *vai* favours this.

[2] Sayana interprets *sādhantā* either as dual or as equivalent to *sādhayantam*. In the original the *pada* has *Varunam ca risadasam* (cf Pischel, *Vedische Studien* III, 190)

[3] This is the most probable interpretation of *Rudravartani*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien* I, 53, but cf III 71, Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 49 Others take as 'whose path is terrible' Sāyana renders 'whose path is like that of Rudra unobstructed' According to R's division, here and above, *āha* must be taken as 'He says' (the verse), but the position of *asya* is hardly possible and the later examples show conclusively that *āha* goes with what follows, as it is taken in S

or for whom a Hotr priest who knows recites the verse, 'Ye All gods, protectors, supporters of men, come hither' (RV, I, 3, 7) In the verse, 'Ye givers, (come to) the libation of the giver' (RV, I, 3, 7c), he means the libation of every giver Whatever a man wishes when he recites this verse, that wish the gods fulfil, if this he knows or if for him a Hotr priest who knows recites In the verse, 'May the holy[4] Sarasvati accept our sacrifice, she that is rich in prayer' (RV, I, 3, 10), speech is denoted by 'rich in prayer' Speech is his who knows this or for whom a Hotr priest who knows this recites When he says, 'May she accept our sacrifice,' he means, 'May she bear it away' These verses if said straight on number twenty-one[5] Man consists of twenty-one elements He has ten fingers, ten toes, and the trunk is the twenty first By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-first By repeating the first thrice and the last thrice the verses become twenty five The trunk is the twenty fifth, and Prajapati is the twenty fifth He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth By this hymn he adorns the trunk, the twenty-fifth Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, the *stoma* hymn of that day is twenty five,[6] like is brought about by like So the two are twenty-five

## ADHYAYA 2

The two tristichs, 'Thee like a car to aid us' (RV, VIII, 68, 1-3), and, 'This juice is poured, O Vasu' (RV, VIII, 2, 1-3) are the first and second of the Marutvatiya hymn[1] Both are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremony[2] *Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and* (the Marutvatiya) is the atonement. Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (Marutvatiya) as their rest He rests who knows this and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this Marutvatiya In the verse, 'Indra, come

[4] Probably the original form was *pavakā* Arnold *Vedic Metre*, p 143, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xi, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 110

[5] Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin

[6] The *stoma* peculiar to the Mahāvrata is the *pañcavimśa stoma* in the *rajana* melody in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra corresponding to the Mahaduktha, Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 7 3, 4 The explanation of Prajapati as twenty fifth is variously given, cf Friedländer's note on Śankhayana Āranyaka I, 1, and see also below, II, 2 4

[1] This is the first Śastra at the midday pressing The *pragathas* used are made up of two verses expanded (Sayana *yasminn ṛgdvayasamuhe pragrathanena trcah sampadyate sa yam pragathah*) The *dhayyas* are interpolated verses to fill up the Śastra For the terminology, *pratipad* and *anucara*, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 103 For *uktha* below, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLI, xii-xv

[2] See I, 1, 3

higher, with thy strengths preserve thy singers'[3] (RV, VIII, 53, 5-6) (there is[4] the word 'singers'), this day indeed is a hymn, and being possessed of a hymn, the form of this day is perfect (There is the word 'hero') in the verse, 'Let Brahmanaspati come forth, hither the hero' (RV, I, 40, 3[ac]), the form of this day indeed is perfect as endowed with strength (There is the word 'heroic might') in the verse, 'Rise up, O Brahmanaspati, heroic might' (RV, I, 40, 1[a], 2[b]), the form of this day is perfect as endowed with might (There is the word 'hymn') in the verse, 'Now doth Brahmanaspati proclaim the hymn of praise' (RV, I, 40, 5), this day indeed is a hymn and the form of this day as endowed with a hymn is perfect (There is the word 'slaying Vrtra') in the verse, 'Agni, the slayer of Vṛtra, will bear' (RV, III, 20, 4[ac]), the slaying[5] of Vrtra is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day. (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'Thou art strong by insight, O Soma, thou art mighty in thy might and greatness' (RV, I, 91, 2[ac]), might indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'strong') in the verse, 'They fill full the waters, they lead forth the strong one[6] like a horse for rain' (RV, I, 64, 6[d]), strength indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day Further in that verse, 'They milk the thundering never failing spring' (RV, I, 64, 6) (there is the word 'thundering'), thundering indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's, and Indra's is the form of this day (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'To great Indra' (RV, VIII, 89 3), what indeed is great, is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect. (There is the word 'great') in the verse, 'Sing a great song to Indra' (RV, VIII, 89, 1), what indeed is great is large, the form of this day as endowed with largeness is perfect (There are the words 'was in the way of' and 'stayed not') in the verse, 'No one was in the way of,[7] none stayed, the chariot of

[3] Sayana takes *prasutir* as a noun = *anujña deya*

[4] This is I take it, the meaning The verses contain words because the day has certain qualities. It is also possible to invert the relation, and derive from the epithets in the verses the qualities of the day but the position of the verse in the sentence points to the former interpretation as slightly the more probable, and that view is supported by Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka, I 3 ad fn. *mahadvad hy etad ahah* The literal version is 'As to the words, &c'

[5] The argument seems to be (1) *Vṛtrahā* occurs in the verse, because (2) Indra is *Vṛtraha*, and (3) the day is Indra's. Possibly it may be, because the word *Vṛtraha* occurs, therefore, Indra is *Vṛtraha* and this is Indra's day

[6] *vajinam* means 'having food' according to Sayana It clearly meant originally 'having energy' Cf Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 18 and Index, s. v *vāja*, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 10, 45

[7] Sayana renders *paryasa* as *svartham na calitavan* and *na siramad* as *tena rathena ramanam api śatrur na krtavan*, and *paryastavat* as *lokāntaragaman ya paritalcalanavat* It is difficult not to believe that this absurd interpretation, which is that of the Āranyaka, was

Sudās' (RV., VII, 32, 10); the form of this day as endowed with the terms *paryasta* and *rānti* is perfect. He recites all the Pragāthas to obtain all the days, all the Ukthas,[1] all the Pṛṣṭhas,[2] all the Śastras, all the Praūgas, all the pressings of the Soma.

2. He recites[1] the hymn, 'Fair has been my effort, singer; slayer of truth' (RV., X, 27). True, indeed, is this day and perfect its form as endowed with truth. This hymn is composed by Vasukra. Vasukra indeed is *brahman*, and this day is *brahman*. Thus by *brahman* is *brahman* commenced. Here they ask: 'Why then is the Marutvatīya Śastra commenced by Vasukra's hymn?' Because no other than Vasukra produced[2] a Marutvatīya Śastra nor separated it. Therefore by the hymn of Vasukra the Marutvatīya Śastra is commenced. This hymn is not addressed to any definite deity[3] and is therefore Prajāpati's. For Prajāpati is undefined, and the hymn serves to win Prajāpati. Once[4] he describes Indra, and so the hymn retains its form as Indra's. He recites the hymn, 'Drink the Soma, for which in anger thou breakest' (RV., VI, 17) (There is the word 'mightily') in the verse, 'The cow stall, Indra, mightily being lauded;' the form of this day as endowed with the word mightily[5] is perfect. This hymn is

deliberately chosen wrongly The exact sense of the original is, however, open to doubt, cf. Ludwig and Griffith's translations.

[1] The Ukthas here meant, Sāyana says, are those for the *ukthyakratus*, following the Yajñāyajñīya Sāman. The Pṛṣṭhas are the four Pṛṣṭha Stotras of the midday pressing. The Śastras are those of the Ājya and other rites The Praūgas are the Śastras of the Praugi and are specially mentioned on the *nyāya*, *brahmaṇā āgataḥ parivrājakā apy āgatāḥ* (so S; R reads *abhy*°, which is nonsense).

[2] For these, see Eggeling, *S B. E*, XXVI, 339 For *aptyai* and the very numerous similar datives, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 274, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970. They differ from ordinary infinitives in not being construed clearly as verbal forms, but governing the genitive as here and in Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 5, 6, &c., and as always in Celtic (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p 535)

[1] This Khaṇḍa contains the general form as well as the specifically Mahāvrata part of the Marutvatīya. See on V, 1, 1, which gives only the special part, and cf. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 3, where Vasukra is equated to Indra He occurs also in Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 30, &c.

[2] i e. brought out of the Saṃhitā. The perf. here has a certain propriety, it expresses a relation not exactly that of mere past, and approximates to a present. Cf n. 6 For *atha kasmāt*, cf Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 24, 7, &c

[3] Cf. Macdonell, *Sarvānukramaṇī*, p. 183, *Bṛhaddevatā*, II, 256, Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 7, 8 See Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III, 30, 3 *te ete dhāyye anirukte Prājāpatye*, VI, 20, 18; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XXIII, 2; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 6, 5; Nirukta, VII, 4 Sāyana says Prajāpati is *anirukta* as he has no *mūrti*. Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 1 has: *anirukto vai Prajāpatiḥ* Cf. Weber, *Ind Stud*, XVII, 333; Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p 16.

[4] In RV., X, 27, 22. The Bṛhaddevatā and Sarvānukramaṇī ascribe X, 27-29 generally to Indra, with certain exceptions (Macdonell, *Bṛhaddevatā*, I, 127).

[5] Clearly the Āraṇyaka takes *mahi* as an accusative = *mahad*, and presumably, like Sāyana, *gṛṇānaḥ* as active. *Mahi* in the original is taken by Griffith in his translation as a vocative from

composed by Bharadvāja, and Bharadvāja was of seers the most learned, the longest lived, and the greatest practiser of austerities By this hymn he drove away evil When[6] therefore a man recites the hymn of Bharadvāja, it is that

*mahīn* against the accent. Cf. also Grassmann and Ludwig's translations. For the passive sense of *gṛṇana* cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 362, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* p 264

[6] The form *apahatyā* may be either a dative, 'for the driving away,' or an ablative, more probably the latter, as presumably the sense is that Bharadvaja attained his length of years by the hymn rather than the reverse *āsa* above is clearly differentiated in time from the narrative, cf Śaṅkhāyana Aranyaka, VI 1, where the imperfect *avasat* describes the dwelling from time to time of Gargya Balaki, while *asa* is used to denote his permanent character, and *uvaca* in describing his conversation with Ajātaśatru This use of the perfect as a narrative tense is not a sign of lateness when the use is different from that of the imperfect In the Tandya Mahabrahmana itself *uvaca* and *asa* (XIII, 6 9) are both found in such cases. Cf also Aitareya Brahmana, III, 48, 5 *Bharadvajo ha vai kṛśo dīrghaḥ palita asa | so 'bravīt |*, and III, 48, 4 The position of the Aitareya Brahmana and Āranyaka as early appear clearly from the following table of the proportion of perfects to imperfects (see Whitney, *P A O S*, May, 1891, pp lxxxv sq, slightly modified) —

| | |
|---|---|
| Tandya Mahābrāhmana, 1 130 | Śatapatha Brahmana XII, 1 2 |
| Taittiriya Saṃhita 1 70 | Jaiminiya Brahmana, 1 4 |
| Maitrayaṇiya Saṃhita, 1 64 | Gopatha Brahmana, II, 1 5 |
| Taittiriya Brahmana, 1 20 | „ „ I 1 2 |
| Taittiriya Āranyaka, 1 9 | Kauṣitaki Brahmana, 3 5 |
| Śatapatha Brahmana, VI–VIII, 1 20, I V, 9 11 | Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 4 1 |
| | Aitareya Brahmana, I IV, 1 40 |
| „ „ XIII 1 5 XI 5 4 | „ „ V, 1 16 |
| „ „ IX, 2 5, XIV, 7 5 | „ „ VI 1 2 |
| „ „ X, 1 3, (including Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad) | „ „ VII, 4 1 |
| | „ „ VIII, 5 3 |

The earlier part of the Aitareya (I XXVI) can thus claim to be older than anything save the Pañcaviṃśa and the Samhitas and may be as old (for in such small matters as those of the Aitareya the proportions are not fair) as the Saṃhitas (Brahmana parts of course) Against this sporadic cases like *sam lokete, lajjate, sacava* (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxx) cannot be regarded as of decisive weight *lajjamanā* indeed as a Prakritism[a] would be note

[a] Fick *Bezz Beitr*, VII, 270 takes *lajj* from Ind. Germ. *logʷ* according to the ordinary and early phonetic rule, if so the Prakritism would disappear The view of Leumann (Wackernagel, I, 220) is, however, more probable, cf. also Dr Scheftelowitz's forthcoming book, *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* § 10 Dr Scheftelowitz gives an interesting example of the way in which the texts were corrupted (though he does not apply it for this purpose) In later Vedic times *ts* and *ks* became frequently *cch*, and such forms found their way into the text of old work instead of the proper forms Later still efforts were made to replace correct forms instead of obvious Prakritisms with in some cases unfortunate results. E.g in Samaveda, I 3, 1, 4 9 (= I, 231) *pṛkṣu* as Benfey (*Glossar*, p 128) says is for RV, VIII, 31, 15 *pṛtsu* via *pṛcchu* So may be explained *enksva* Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 9 (cf. Aufrecht's ed., p. 428), for *entsva* (ā + √indh). Cf in Naighaṇṭuka, II, 17, *pṛtsudhah* (cf Roth's crit. note, p 16) for RV *pṛkṣu*, and for *ṛksala* (*K Z*, XL, 264 sq) the MSS of Atharvaveda, X, 9, 23, offer either *ṛtsāra* or *ṛcchāra* (Lanman, *Album Kern*,

he may become, by the driving away of evil, learned, long-lived, and versed in asceticism; for that he recites the hymn of Bharadvāja. He recites the hymn, 'With what splendour do ye who are of equal age and dwell together?' (RV., I, 165). (There is the word 'praises') in the verse, 'They call for me, the praises long for me' (RV., I, 165, 4[c]); this day is praise and the form of this day as endowed with praise is perfect. This is the *kayāśubhīya* hymn,[1] and it is harmony and

worthy, but when it is considered that the form is unique (III, 22, 7), that the later language had always √*laj* and that *lajjā* was a common word, there can surely be no hesitation in restoring *lajyamanā*, just as the Atharvan Prākritisms, cited above, must be removed. The exact verbal form of the text cannot always be relied upon, and it may be noted that, as Sāyana's note on VII, 10; 11 shows, in his time some versions of the Aitareya Brāhmana had, which some had not, these chapters, of which the second is a mere corruption of Kausītaki Brāhmana, VII, 11 (see Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brāhmana*, pp 236, 382, 444). The case of the Gopatha Brāhmana may be held to contradict the deductions here accepted, since Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp. 164 sq.) has shown grounds for holding that the Pūrva is not later than the Uttara, but this objection is not of importance, since it is the case that the two parts owe most of their grammatical forms to these sources and the Pūrva borrows from the Śatapatha Brāhmana, XI and XII, in the first of which books the number of perfects is very high, while the Uttara exploits the Aitareya, &c The potential in *sīta* (see Aufrecht, p 429) also urged as a sign of late date is merely, in all probability, an inaccurate analogical form to forms like *īta* (*dadhīta*, &c), and gives no criterion of date (cf. Liebich, *Panini*, p 32) *āmantrayām āsa* occurs only in VII, 17 and proves nothing for the earlier part of the Brāhmana. Pānini, III, 1, 40, allows only *kr* (Liebich, p 33); but as there can be no doubt of the priority of the Aitareya Brāhmana to Pānini (cf. Liebich's own paper, *Bezz Beitr*, XI, 309), this clearly shows either the selective character of Pānini's work or more probably the incorrect transmission of the text (the Śāṅkhāyana has *cakre*, Liebich, pp 80, 81). The use of *evām* (for *evam*) is apparently a note of the Aitareya Brāhmana's style, not a proof of date.[b] Liebich (p. 30) holds that *āsa* was obsolete in Pānini's day in prose and says Yāska uses only *babhūva*. I cannot accept this view as to Panini.

[1] The story of Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts has received full treatment from Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp. 108–119) He holds that RV, I, 170, 171, and 165 make up an Itihāsa to the effect that Agastya offered a sacrifice to the Maruts. Indra came and claimed it, and Agastya had to pacify Indra and the Maruts The result is possible, but not certain. The Kausītaki Brāhmana, XXVI, 9, has (as amended by Sieg, p 117, n. 7): *kayā śubhā*

p 301; Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 604) So in Khila, I, 2, 9[a], MSS. read *prīnayanti* for *prīnanti* and this Prākritism is found in Varttika 1 to Pānini, VII, 3, 37. See also Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 135.

[b] Aufrecht's view (*Aitareya Brāhmana*, p vi) of the dependence of the Brāhmana parts of the Taittirīya Saṃhitā seems borne out by the citations in his 'Anmerkungen'. It may be noted that the Brahmana parts of the Saṃhitā cannot well be separated much in point of time from the Brāhmana itself and that Brāhmana deals with the late Purusamedha (Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch. Litt*, I, 167). Cf. also Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 3, 10, 5 and Taittirīya Brāhmana, I, 5, 5, 6 with Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 13, 3 (ibid., p. 184, n. 2). Noteworthy also is Winternitz's remark (p. 175, n 1) that in Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā, XXX, Buddhists are not mentioned, though that section must be later than the oldest Brāhmanas.

abiding, the *kayāśubhīya* hymn For by means of it Indra, Agastya, and the Maruts came to harmony So the recitation of the *kayāśubhīya* hymn tends to harmony. Further the hymn tends to long life So if the sacrificer be dear to the priest, let him recite for him[8] the *kayāśubhīya* hymn He recites the hymn, 'Indra, with the Maruts, powerful, for joy' (RV., III, 47) There are the words 'Indra, powerful', power indeed is a characteristic of Indra, this day is Indra's and Indra's its form This hymn is composed by Viśvāmitra. Now Viśvāmitra was the friend of all, and all is the friend of him who knows this and of those for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this hymn. The hymn 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV., X, 73) is one containing *nivids*,[9] and, as belonging to the one day ceremonial, is perfect in form Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden, and (this hymn) is the atonement Now atonement is rest, and at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (*nividdhana*) as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom a Hotr priest, who knows this, recites this *nividdhana*. If recited straight on, the verses number ninety seven[10] The ninety is made up of three *virāj* sets of thirty, and then

*savayasah samḍa iti marutvatīyam | tad etat samjñanam santani suktam | etena hendraś ca Marutaś ca samajanatam*, which must go back to the same source as the Aitareya version, found also in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 16 which agrees verbally with this passage For *samjñana* see also Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp 72, 73

[8] The gen here is probably possessive and predicative (*eius faciat*), cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, §§ 63 and 71, Liebich, *Bezz Beitr*, XI, 307 sq, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 162, while the gen with *priya* is adnominal and regular from RV onwards. Not unnatural is the transition from such genitives to the genitive which is really a dative, e g Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 15, 7 *tasya śatam dattvā* would if *krtvā* were put for *dattva* be quite regular On the other hand in *tasya śrad dadhāti* (ibid., II, 40, 6) the gen. is practically datival In Pali (Muller, *Pali Grammar*, p. 67) and in Prakrit (Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, p 246) the dative of the indirect objective is always represented by the genitive, the dative of purpose alone surviving Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297 Note the dative with *mitram* below, and genitive in *ekesam paśunam*, I, 2, 3, and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, I, 283 On the low morality of the Brahmanas cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p 9, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch. Litt*, I 180 sq, Garbe, *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p 62

[9] In Śankhayana Aranyaka, I, 3 the *nivid* is in RV, VI, 19, see Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 19, 20. The *prakrti* is as here ibid., 15, Kausitaki Brahmana, XXV, 3 *Nivids* are early and apparently were known in Ṛgvedic times, cf Haug, *Aitareya Brahmana* pp 32 sq, Weber, *Ind Stud*, IX, 355, XVIII, 96, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p 387, n 2, Eggeling *S B E*, XII, 114 n 2, Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp 136 sq Here the *nivid* comes in after the sixth verse

[10] Sayana explains thus the two *trcas* referred to in I, 2, 1 = 6, six *pragāthas* each of two verses made into a *trca* = 18, three *dhāyyas* = 3, *asat su* = 24, *piba somam* = 15, *kayā śubha* = 15, *marutvān* Indra = 5, *janisthā ugrah* = 11, total 97 But in I, 2, 1 there are seven *pragathas* which would give 100 Apparently the author overlooked this, although of course the explanations are possible Oldenberg (*Prolegomena*, p 353) thinks that some of the *pragathas* may have been counted as two, others as three verses

there are seven which are over. Whatever is praise of the seven is also praise of the ninety. If the first and last are repeated thrice the verses number 101. There are five four-jointed[11] fingers, two pits, the arm, the collar bone, the shoulder-blade; these make up twenty-five. The other parts[12] have twenty-five each, making a hundred, and the trunk is the one hundred and first part. The hundred is life,[13] health, strength, glory; the sacrificer is the hundred and first, resting on life, health, strength, glory. These verses become *tristubh*.[14] For the midday pressing is accompanied by *tristubh* verses.[15]

3 They ask, 'Why is a swing[1] a swing?' He who blows is the swing He

[11] The four are, according to Sāyana, *agra*, *madhya*, *mula*, *tanmūla*, and he notes that though the *angustha* has really only three, it is given a fourth for the sake of symmetry So in the systems of Caraka and Suśruta (Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 122, 123) there are sixty phalanges, giving fifteen in each hand Here the phalanges and the metacarpus are reckoned as phalanges In Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 5, each *pani*, on the other hand, is given three *parvāni*, which is the more correct view, and perhaps later. The expression *kaksasi* is doubtful. It cannot mean 'armpits', for there is but one on each side; Max Muller says the pits 'in the elbow and the arm'; Monier-Williams, *Dict* (where the reference is inaccurate) gives the sense as the two depressions on the wrist, Sāyana says *kaksayа parśvadvayam*, and possibly the armpit may be conceived of as in some way double. He takes, followed by Max Muller, *aksah* as eye, but (*a*) *śiras* is a separate element and the eye belongs to it; (*b*) the form is unparalleled Friedlander holds that *aksa* (Ar. *aša*, Lat *axilla*, O H.G *ahsala*) means 'shoulder blade', but that is the meaning of *amsaphalaka* in the systems of Caraka (Hoernle, *J.R.A S*, 1907, p 13), perhaps of Suśruta and Vāgbhata (*J R A.S*, 1906, p. 931, *Osteology*, pp 76, 91) So *aksa* must mean 'collar-bone', as I would take it in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 4 (*akṣā* and *aksah*) and as in the Śatapatha Brāhmana (*ākṣa*). The later form is usually *aksaka*, though *aksa* is found in the 'non medical version of Ātreya', see Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp. 55, 134, n 1, and my review, *Z D M.G*, LXII, 135 sq Sāyana's error is found in the commentators on Yajñavalkya and in the modern translations

[12] i e the left side, and the two sides of the lower body, which have five four jointed toes, a thigh, a leg, and three *parvāni* ('joints', Max Muller, rather 'articulations', Hoernle, *J R A.S.*, 1906, p 931) according to Sayana

[13] Because life is one hundred years and the other things depend upon it, Sāyana explains, probably correctly, as there is no doubt that life as one hundred years is a very early idea, see Lanman, *Sanskrit Reader*, p 384 and reff, and Weber, *Ind Stud*, XVII, 193, *Festgruss an Roth*, p. 137. Cf. Vajasaneyi Samhita Upanisad, 2.

[14] Because the last hymn is *tristubh* (Sāyana) But all the hymns in that Khanda are in *tristubh*.

[15] Cf Aitareya Brahmana, III, 12, 3-5, Śatapatha Brāhmana, IV, 2, 5, 20, and other passages cited by Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, 4 For the form *prauga*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 41; *Z D M.G*, XL, 678

[1] The use of the swing refers, in the opinion of Oldenberg (*Religion des Veda*, p. 444), to the sun, which is called 'the golden swing in heaven' in RV, VII, 87, 5. This is quite probable, as the Mahāvrata rite is, at least to some extent, a sun charm (cf. Introd, p 28) Sāyana's interpretation follows the text and makes the swing Vāyu, as does Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, I, 7 I, 2, 4 below is in favour of the sun, cf. Kathaka Samhitā, XXXIV, 5, cited in *Ind. Stud*, III, 477. Compare the *dolāyātrā* of the young Krsna, clearly a vegetation rite

swings forward in these worlds and then is a swing a swing 'There should be one plank,[1] some say, 'for the wind blows in one way and (the swing should be) like the wind' But this is not to be accepted[2] Others say, 'There should be three planks, for threefold are these worlds and (the swing should) resemble them' But this is not to be accepted There should be two planks, for these two worlds[3] seem most real, and the ether between them is the sky. So let there be two planks. Let them be of *udumbara* wood[4] The *udumbara* is sap and proper food, and planks of it serve to win sap and proper food. Let them be raised in the middle For in the middle food delights men, and so he places the sacrificer in the middle of proper food. There are two kinds of ropes,[5] the right and the left The right serves for some animals, the left for others. When there are both kinds, they serve to win both kinds of animals. The ropes should be of *darbha*[6] grass For of all plants *darbha* is free of evil,[7] and so they should be of *darbha* grass

[2] This is the constant phrase of the Aitareya Brāhmana. That of the Kausītaki Brahmana and it may be added of the Śaṅkhayana Araṇyaka, is *na tad adriyeta* Cf. Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana* p. 432, Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp 38, n 6, 44 n 1

[3] The ether or sky is as Sayana points out, invisible *Addhatama* (for *addha*, cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 178, and Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 228) is a curious word, which occurs also in the Śatapatha Brahmana, which also has, VI, 3, 1, 24, *anaddhapurusa*, on which see Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 221, n. 2, Eggeling, *S B E*, XLI, 197, Hillebrandt *Ritual Litteratur*, p. 167

[4] Cf Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I 7, where there is one plank only *tad va audumbaram bhavaty urg va annadyam udumbara urja annadyasyopāptyai* The seat of the Udgatṛ also is of *udumbara* wood Taṇḍya Mahābrahmana, V, 5, 2 *audumbari bhavaty ūrg udumbara urjam evavarundhe* The Śaṅkhayana passages look like an imitation, while the Aitareya may well have followed the Tāṇḍya (cf *avaruddhyai*) Taittirīya Brahmana, I, 2, 6, 5, has *ū́rg vā́ ánnam udumbárah.* Cf. also Śatapatha Brahmana III 2, 1, 23 and often.

[5] Sayana explains right and left as fashioned by the right and left hands respectively, perhaps twisted from left to right and right to left respectively The plural *rajjavaḥ* is probably due as he says to the fact that as is said in V, 1, 3 Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 2, 3, the ropes are each of three strands It should be noted that Āraṇyaka V differs in the purpose assigned to the ropes which it associates with the holding together of the swing Similarly it recognizes the number of planks as three or two, while two is here prescribed Again, I, 2, 4 the height of the swing is fixed at a *musti*, while V 1, 3 gives as alternatives *caturangula* or *musti* These remind us that the last book must differ considerably in date from the first.

[6] On *darbha* cf. Eggeling *S B E*, XII, 84, Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 70.

[7] The construction of the genitive with a positive is based on the analogy of the superlative, e g *infra*, I, 2, 4 (Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 65, 91 II). Similarly the ablative is found dependent on a positive, e g RV, X, 10, 4 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 390), Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 58, *Sanskrit Syntax*, p. 78, Delbruck, *Grundriss*, III, 1, 216, Pischel, *Gott Gel Anz.*, 1884 p 509 *Vedische Studien*, I, 309 Geldner, ibid, III, 76 77, and see II, 3 1, n. 6 For the word *apahatapapma*, cf Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 25 4 *apahatapāpmānah* and *anapahatapapmanah*, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, IV, 3, 21 (Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, 168, n 3), Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 2, 9, VIII, 1, 5, 4 1, 7, 1

they[7] mount to food and fortune The Hotrakas[8] with the Brahman sit down on seats of grass Plants and trees having grown up bear fruit So then if they mount all together on this day they mount on strength, on sap, on proper food. This serves to win sap[9] and proper food Some say, 'Let him descend[10] after saying *vaṣaṭ*'[11] But this is not to be accepted For the honour done to one that sees it not[12] is indeed not done Others say, 'Let him descend after taking the food' But this is not to be accepted For the honour done to one that has approached near is indeed not done Let him descend after seeing the food For that is honour indeed which is done to one who sees it. Therefore only after seeing the food, let him descend Let him descend towards the east, for in the east is born the seed[13] of the gods Then let him descend towards the east.

[7] They, i e the Hotṛ and Udgātṛ Max Müller follows R in translating 'he', but this makes nonsense and the commentary shows that R is wrong

[8] They are the Hotṛ's assistants, viz. Praśāstṛ, Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin, Potṛ, Neṣṭṛ, Agnīdhra, and Acchāvāka The division is not strictly accurate, as the second, third, and fifth are really classed with the Brahman and the Neṣṭṛ with the Adhvaryu but it corresponds to facts better than the later classifications, see Weber *Ind Stud*, X, 144 sq , Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 383 sq , Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p. 97 *vṛsih* may perhaps be better spelt *bṛsih* Both the *v* or *b* and *s* present difficulties, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 184, 233, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 36 See Geiger, *Litt und Sprache d Singhalesen*, p 28 The following sentence is quoted in the Naigeya Anukramaṇī, *Ind Stud*, XVII, 373 374

[9] Max Muller suggests that *iṣa* before *ūrjaḥ* is expected If it had occurred, it would have been quite natural, but it is not necessary to suspect the text as the reading above is *rasam eva tad ūrjam annādyam* and the *eva tad* renders it less unnatural that *iṣa* should not occur The phrase *eva tad* is very common in the Aitareya Brahmana, *tad* being of course adverbial. For the usual asyndeton, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 59

[10] The descent does not of course come here in its proper order, but is inserted to complete the discussion of the topic of the movements of the priests.

[11] The reason for this being rejected is that it is only after the second *vaṣaṭ* (the *anuvaṣaṭ*) that this *bhakṣa* comes up, so that it could not see the priest on the swing descending in its honour (Sāyana) For the word, cf Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 172 Foy, *Z D M G*, L, 139, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 34, Weber, *Ind Stud*, XVIII, 269, for the form, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1091

[12] For the form *apaśyate* cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, i, 77, Delbruck, *Vergl Syntax* II, 529 sq, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 540 sq *Adhyṛṣtiya* appears clearly to come from √ṛṣ in the sense 'move' (cf Greek ταλαίπωρος) The separation into two roots (maintained in Bohtlingk and Monier Williams' *Dict*) seems quite needless (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, &c, p. 140), as *ṛṣṭi*, spear, can easily be derived from √ṛṣ as trans. Cf also Khila, IV, 5 3 (ed Scheftelowitz)

[13] Max Müller suggests, and S apparently independently also suggests, that the reading may be *devaretaḥ samprajāyate* But the use of *samprajāyate* is curious as the *sam* has no intelligible force and on the other hand the form *retasa* is not impossible, as forms from *a as*, *asa*, exchange more or less freely throughout Sanskrit, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 415, 1319, and a long list in Wackernagel, op cit, II i 113 114, In a Bahuvrīhi *aguretas* occurs in the Śatapatha, ibid, 111 In Pali of course the *asa* form prevails, Müller, *Pali Grammar*, p 65 Cf also Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, §§ 407 sq

## ADHYĀYA 3.

They say, 'Let him begin this day[1] with saying the word *him*' In the word *him* is *brahman*, this day is *brahman*, and so he begins *brahman* by means of *brahman*,[2] who knows this Now with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is masculine,[3] and the *rc* feminine. They make a pair and so he makes a pair at the beginning of the hymn for the sake of offspring Children and cattle are his who knows this Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is to *brahman* like a wooden shovel [4] Just as one desires to dig up anything with a wooden shovel, so with the word one digs up *brahman* Whatever he desires, he digs up with the word *him*, who knows this Again with regard to his beginning with the word *him*, the word is the discrimination of divine and human speech [5] So he, who begins with the utterance of the word *him*, discriminates divine and human speech

[1] The time of *himkrtya* and *pratipadyate* are obviously really identical This is readily explained by the originally timeless force of the form *krtya* (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 889, 894) So the aorist participle in Greek sometimes coincides with the time of the verb, e g Monro, *Homeric Grammar*², p 212 Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, pp 405-409) holds that in all these cases the distinction of time between the main verb and the gerund exists, but, however natural the growth of this use is, it is only to be found in the examples by forcing the sense Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 223) lays stress on the 'aoristic' effect of the weak root and appears to think that this accounts for the past force But it should be noted that in Vedic we have no evidence that the forms were ever felt as other than participles either present or past. In *striyam drstvāya kitavám tatāpa* it is most probable that the writer did not feel *drstvaya* as = 'after having seen', but as 'seeing' Cf my remarks in *J R A S*, 1907 p 164 For beginning the Mahavrata with *him*, cf Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka, II, 1 For *him* + √*kr*, cf Whitney, § 1079 It is obsolete in the classical language

[2] Cf I, 1, 3, 2, 2

[3] Cf I, 2, 4 The use is found in the Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 3, and often in the Śatapatha Brāhmana For the idea, cf the stories of the wedlock of the *sāman* and *rc* in the Śatapatha (IV, 6, 7, 11, &c), and Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmanas, and Aitareya Brahmana, III, 23, 1.

[4] Sayana explains this as a metaphor from the search of hidden treasure, a probable supposition in the case of India, where burial of treasure (cf *Gautama Dharma Sutra* X, 43 45, Vasistha Dharma Sutra, IV, 13, 14, Manu, VIII, 35-39, Yajñavalkya, II, 34, 35) has always been frequent in consequence of the uncertainty of life and government A different idea is found in Śatapatha Brahmana, VI, 3, 2, 5 4, &c

[5] That is, it distinguishes ordinary conversation from divine service The Śankhayana Āranyaka II, 1, gives different reasons for the importance of *him* In Śatapatha Brahmana, VI, 3, 1, 34, where the same distinction occurs, Sayana explains as Sanskrit and Apabhramśa (Eggeling, *S B E*, XLI, 200, n), *daivyat* must be correct *devyat* cannot well be adjectival, and the error in the MSS is trifling Cf III, 2, 5 It is noteworthy that later *daivi vāc* is used for Sanskrit, cf Dandin Kavyadarśa I, 33 *samskrtam nama daivi vag anvakhyata maharsibhih* Franke (*Pali und Sanskrit*, p 89) compares the fact that Mathura was called 'city of the gods' because of the Kusana title *devaputra*, and is inclined to think that 'secondary' Sanskrit came to India from Kaśmir via Mathura, a hypothesis which can hardly be regarded as probable

2. They say, 'What is the beginning of this day?' Let him reply, 'Mind and speech'[1] All desires rest on the one, the other yields all desires. All desires rest on the mind,[2] for with the mind man conceives all desires. All desires rest on him who knows this Speech yields all desires, for by speech man expresses all desires Speech yields all desires to him who knows this Then they say, 'One should not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from[3] a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse' So one should say the *vyāhṛtis* first The *vyāhṛtis* are *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, and *svar*,[4] and they are the three Vedas *Bhūh* is the Rgveda, *bhuvah* the Yajurveda, and *svar* the Sāmaveda[5] Therefore

The real meaning of the discrimination is suggested by Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 18, 13 *om iti vai daivam tatheti mānuṣam | daivena caivainam tan mānuṣena ca pāpād enasaḥ pramuñcati*, cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 162, n 1. The later use of *daivī vāc* must be related to Devanāgarī For the question of Prākrit, cf I, 5, 2, n In the Rāmāyana passage where Hanumant ponders as to addressing Sītā, the possibilities he contemplates are (according to Jacobi) *vācam mānuṣīm samskṛtām*, or *dvijātir iva*, *vācam samskṛtām* which appears clearly to discriminate between the popular and sacerdotal forms of Sanskrit That the former expression means (as Dr Grierson, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 56, holds) the Prākrit of the educated Kṣatriyas and well to do persons round the court appears excessively improbable Nor is it correct to say that these forms of Sanskrit were practically alike The Epic and the Sanskrit of the Brahminical schools are of distinctively different style, and Sītā might well have been surprised at being addressed not in the Kṣatriya fashion but by priestly expressions, much as a lady of the middle ages would find a great difference between the address of a countess and a monk, even when both spoke the same Latin language

[1] Sāyana explains this as referring to the need for care in going through the service, composed as it is of mixed verses

[2] Sayana explains that the desires are phases of mind, *manovṛttiviśeṣah* which is too subtle for the Aranyaka. Cf Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, III, 2 *manasā hi kaman kāmayate*, and Jacob, *Concordance*, p 292, Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 2, 3

[3] Max Muller following Sayana, takes the words *naeco—syad iti* as giving the ground for the rule referred to in *tad āhur* But this leaves no *iti* to mark the end of the rule referred to in *tad āhur*, and in view of the usual practice of the Āranyaka, it is safer to take the quotation as extending to *syad* There is no doubt that the construction of the last part of the sentence is not easy For the abl, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 107 sq, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 51

[4] For the later history of the triad see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p 196, E T, p 217 See also Jaiminīya Upanisad Brahmana, III, 15, IV, 28, and I, 1 Taittirīya Upanisad, I, 5, 6, shows clear signs of a later origin than the Aitareya by its elaboration

[5] On the three Vedas and the Atharvaveda, see especially Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, pp 21 sq, Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 191 sq, Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp 2 sq The silence of the Āranyaka is certainly in favour of its early date It is of course true that the Atharvaveda contains much old material[a] and probable that a Samhita existed before the Aranyaka was written (cf Taittirīya Samhita, VII, 5 11, 2, where the Angirases are referred to

[a] I agree with Winternitz that Oldenberg's view (*Literatur des alten Indien*, p 41) that prose magic formulae are older than 'poetic' which are imitations of the poetry of the hymns of the Rgveda is not probable

he does not really begin the day with a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse, nor start from a *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman* verse

3 He begins with *tad*[1] this Now 'this this'[2] is food, and so thus he obtains food Prajāpati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two,[3] viz *tata* or *tata* So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tata* So with this very word with *tata* in it[4] he begins A Ṛṣi says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Bṛhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, merely the deities (who enter the body) but as regards the gods[5] it is made manifest This is the meaning of the verse[6]

(apparently as a fourth Saṃhitā), and Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 110), but the recognition is a sign of later date (Taittirīya Saṃhita, VII, is not probably early, but, like VI, is later than the Aitareya Brahmana)

[1] *Tad* is the first word of the first stanza of the first hymn of the Niṣkevalya Śastra the so-called Rajana, RV, X, 120, 1

✓ [2] It may be rendered 'this word *tad* (= *tat tad iti*), but Sayana takes it as a repetition The repetition of *annam* is apparently not connected with that of *tad* though it may have been helped by it

✓ [3] Max Muller seems to regard the two alternatives as *tat* and *tata* or *tata* This of course is the usual signification of *ekakṣara* and *dvyakṣara* but Sayana refers these words to the quantity of the first and second syllables in *tata* and *tata* respectively The form of the sentences makes this seem certainly correct however unusual it may be We may have here early evidence of the omission of the final *a* in ordinary conversation. ?

[4] I take *tat tatavatyā* separately and *eva tat* as = 'so This seems also to be Sāyana's interpretation Max Muller says 'With this very word, consisting of *tat* or *tatta* [cf. the reading of L] he begins,' and in a note If *tat* is called the very same word, *eva* is used in the sense of *iva* This appears rather unsatisfactory, and Sāyana is probably right in thinking *tat* and *tata* similar enough for the purpose here in view This passage indeed, seems to be a deliberate and somewhat elaborate variant of the older legend (preserved in Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 1, 6) by which Prajāpati when he first spoke uttered *bhūḥ bhuvaḥ*, and *suvar*, which are words of one and two syllables respectively Sāyana has *ekena hrasvena-petaksakṣara* ...*d abhyām hrasvadirghābhyām upetā dvyakṣara* *Ekadvyakṣara* is apparently an adject Dvandva with disjunctive force, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 70, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 73 sq, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 224 sq for early examples. The whole sense is little more than that *tad* which is equal to *tat(a)* or *tat a*) is the name which, as *brahman*, is revealed in the deities and implicit in man in whose organs, &c., the deities are (as in II, 1, 5, Śankhāyana Āranyaka, IX, 1, &c.)

[5] For *adhidaivatam*, cf Chāndogya Upaniṣad, I, 3, 1, &c., Whitney, *P A O S*. Oct., 1890, p li. So often in Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brahmana

[6] This stanza is very obscure Sāyana quotes Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 15, 8, where it is laid down that a child's secret name is only to be known by father and mother until the *upanayana* That this is what is referred to here is not impossible, as Max Muller points out,

4 He begins with,[1] 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1), for that[2] is indeed the oldest in the worlds 'Whence sprung the terrible one with brilliant might,' for from it he was born who is terrible with brilliant might 'Immediately on birth he destroys his foes,' for immediately on being born he destroyed evil 'After whom all helpers rejoice,' for all creatures are helpers, and they rejoice after him, saying, 'He[3] has risen, he has risen' 'Growing by strength, the powerful one' (RV, X, 120, 2) for he grows by strength the powerful one 'As foe he smites fear into the Dāsa,' for all fear him 'Taking that which breathes and that which breathes not,' this refers to the living and the lifeless 'What was offered in the feasts came to thee,' this means, 'all is in thy power' 'All turn their thoughts on thee' (RV X, 120, 3), this means all beings, all minds, all thoughts, turn on thee 'When these two become three helpers,' these two being united produce offspring Children and cattle are his who knows this 'Join what is sweeter than sweet with the sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring sweet, and so with the pair he joins the offspring 'He[4] conquered by the sweet that which is sweet,' for the pair is sweet, the offspring is sweet, and thus through the pair he conquers offspring A Rsi[5] says,

but the interpretation adopted in n 4 above seems to render the reference quite unnecessary The last verse he explains as meaning that the form of the gods who enter the body is hidden from men but the gods themselves know the name well This is practically meaningless, and Max Müller suggests that it may be that the name refers to the gods or to *tad* the *brahman* The reference however, to the deities who enter the body is clearly meant in some form of II, 4 2, 1, 5 and the sense is the *brahman* = *tad* which is the beginning of speech and the first of names is revealed (as the gods) and implicit in man This section is referred to by 'Sayana' on Atharvaveda XVIII, 4 77 see Lanman in Whitney's *Atharvaveda*, p 892

[1] The *trca* RV, X, 120, 1-3, which begins is a *stotriya*, because it corresponds to the Pajuna Saman

[2] i e *brahman* (Sayana) The explanations of this hymn in the Āranyaka must be deliberately perverse so absurd are they Cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xxix n 6

[3] The double *ud gād* is, according to Sayana because he is Āditya of heaven and Agni or earth. The exact use of the aorist is characteristic of the early character of the text, cf Whitney's criticism of Delbruck (*Synt Forsch*, II 8-86, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 280-289) in *A J P* XIII, 290, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 174

[4] Sayana takes *adah* as referring to *mithunam* which is *sumadhu* as consisting of the son and daughter in law *Madhuna* is equal to grandchildren, and *abhiyodh* is 'provide', i e 'provide that dear pair with dear offspring, our grandchildren' He does not therefore even follow the Aranyaka which clearly took *sumadhu* as accusative Max Muller translates 'And this (the son when married) being very sweet conquered through the sweet.' But this represents neither the Aranyaka nor Sayana.

[5] This verse which is not in the Rgveda is not by any means clearly connected with the rest. Sayana gives two alternatives that it is connected with the verse *svādoh svadīyah svadunā srjā sam*, or with the whole Śastra (not as in Max Muller, that it is connected with the hymn *tad it asa*, or the Veda in general) In the first case 'this body' is the body of the sacrificer, the other

'Since he raised this body in that body,' he means this body consisting of the Veda in that corporeal body[6] 'Then let this body[7] be the medicine of that,' he means this body consisting of the Veda is to be the medicine of that corporeal body Of this eight[8] syllables are *gāyatrī*, eleven are *triṣṭubh*, twelve *jagatī*, and ten *virāj* This consisting of ten syllables rests in the other three metres The three syllable word *puruṣa*[9] goes into the *virāj* These indeed are all metres, the three and the *virāj* To him who knows this[10] thus is this day completed with all the metres

5 He extends the verses by the use of *nada*[1] *Nada* indeed is man So a man speaking sounds as it were In the words *nadam va odatīnam*[2] (RV, VIII, 69, 2), *odatyah* are the waters in heaven, for they water all this, and they are the waters of the mouth, for they water all proper food In *nadam yoyuvatīnam*, *yoyuvatyah* are the waters of the sky, for they inundate as it were, and they are the waters of perspiration,[3] for they run constantly as it were. In the words *patim vo aghnyānām*, *aghnyah* are the waters that are born of the smoke of fire,[4] and they are the waters that spring from the organ. In *dhenūnām*

body the body of the parents and the result is seen in *svādoh*, &c. The other case gives the interpretation of the Aranyaka, as Sayana himself admits, *tad etad dvitiyam vyakhyanam asyam rci adima brahmanena spastikriyate* This shows how little Sayana felt bound to follow his authorities The words *evam—avajata* occur in various guises in Atharvaveda, VII, 3, Taittiriya Samhita, I, 7, 12, 2, Maitrayani Samhita, I, 10, 3, Aśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, II, 19, 32, Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra III, 17, 1

[6] The body of the sacrificer (Sayana)

[7] The hymn *tad id asa* (Sayana)

[8] The hymn, RV, X, 120, is *triṣṭubh*, and the desired metres are only obtained by torturing it The first second, and fourth *padas* have ten syllables the third eleven The first eight of the first *pada* give the *gayatrī* the remaining two added to the ten of the second and fourth *padas* the *jagatī*, and the first, second, and fourth (or rather the fourth), the *virāj*

[9] Because by adding *pu* to the first *pada*, *ru* to the second, *sah* to the third, the verses all become *triṣṭubh* See V, 1, 6 [4]

[10] In *evam vid* (perhaps one word), cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 68 *vidusa* may be genitive (cf. n 8 on I, 2, 2) or dative

[1] The exact meaning is explained in V, 1, 6 After each *pada* of RV, X, 120, 1 is inserted (besides the syllables *pu, ru, sah*) one *pada* of the hymn, RV, VIII, 69 2, so as to make a *bṛhatī* Cf Śatapatha Brahmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2, 3, and Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 113, n 1

[2] Sayana explains the verse with reference to juice produced at the third pressing of the Soma, the *ṛjīṣa* (cf Hillebrandt, *Ved Myth*, I, 235 sq), and takes *nadam* as the sacrificer, and supplies *raksata*. For the real sense see Pischel, *Vedische Studien* I, 191 sq

[3] *svedate* is clearly correct, the accusative being cognate Rs *svedante* is primarily attractive but is improbable, and as a perusal of p 80 will show, he (like the MSS., cf. Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct., 1887 p xxv) is very uncertain about nasals. Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 275, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 24, Delbrück, *Vergl Syntax* I, 366 368

[4] Sayana gives two interpretations, either smoke (in the shape of a cloud) produced by fire, or from smoke and fire, quoting Kalidasa, Meghaduta, 4, *dhūmajyotihsalilamarutam*

*rudhyasi*, the *dhena-ah* are the waters, for they stir all this, and by *rudhyasi* he means 'thou art lord'[3] He extends[4] a *trishtubh* and an *anushtubh* For the *trishtubh* is male, the *anushtubh* female, and the two are a pair So a man having taken to himself a wife regards himself as it were more complete By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty five[5] The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajapati is the twenty fifth He has ten fingers, ten toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth He adorns this trunk, the twenty-fifth Further the day (of the sacrifice) is twenty five, and the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty five, like is brought about by like So the two are twenty five.

6 He begins[1] with *tad*, this Now 'this this' is food, and so thus he obtains food Prajapati indeed uttered this as the first word consisting of one syllable or of two, viz *tata* or *tata* So a child when it first speaks utters the word of one or two syllables, *tata* or *tata* So with this very word with *tata* in it he begins A Rsi says (RV, X, 71, 1), 'O Brhaspati, the first point of speech,' for this is the first point of speech 'Which they have uttered making a name,' for by speech are names made 'That of them which was the best and flawless,' for this is the best and flawless 'That is hidden in secret by their love and yet is made manifest,' for this as regards the body is secret, namely the deities (who enter the body), but as regards the gods it is made manifest This is the meaning of the verse

7 He begins with the hymn, 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120, 1) What is oldest is great, the form of this day as possessing greatness[1] is perfect. (There is the word 'greatness') in the verse, 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54, 1), the form of this day as possessing greatness is perfect (There is the word 'strength') in the verse, 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30, 1), the form of this day as possessing strength is perfect

*san nipitah kia nighah* The waters are *aghnya*, he says, because plants and trees are to be tended by all Cf also Brhaddevata IV, 41, which explains RV, I, 164, 43 *Sakamayam dhumam* Atharvaveda, IX, 10, 25

[3] 'Thou art food', in Max Muller's translation must be a slip *patyasi* is regular, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1061, and is found in the Śatapatha Brahmana in this form

[4] *tad id asa* is in *tri tubh*, *nadam va odatinam* in *anu tubh* The former is male because bigger than the latter For the following cf Levi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p 157

[5] The twenty five are made up by nine verses of RV, X, 120, 1, six of X, 54 five of VI, 30 and three of I, 51, 4 which are mentioned in I, 3 7 below Cf I 1 2 4 and n 6 on V, 1, 5

[1] This is a mere repetition of Khanda 3 and the insertion of it here according to Sayana is for the glory of the whole hymn whereas the purpose of it as Khanda 3 was to extol the word *tad* This may be correct, but it is very obscure.

[2] The difference in the first two verses of course is that in the first *pratham* needs to be equated to *mahad*, whereas *mahitva* actually occurs in the second For the construction, cf I, 2, 1, n 4

(There is the word 'hymns') in the verse. 'Then, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), this day is indeed a hymn, and the form of this day as possessing a hymn is perfect. He extends the first two[2] verses, which are deficient, by a syllable. In the small[3] (womb) seed is deposited, in the small (heart) the vital spirits, in the small (stomach) food is placed. This serves for the obtainment of these desires. He obtains these desires who knows this. The two of ten syllables serve to obtain both kinds of proper food, that which is footed and that which is footless.[4] They become eighteen syllables apiece.[5] Of the ten, nine are the breaths,[6] one is the self. This is the perfection of the self. Eight syllables[7] remain in each. Who knows this obtains whatsoever[8] he desires.

8. He extends the verses by means of *nada*.[1] Now breath is sound. Therefore every breath, when it sounds, sounds loud as it were. The verse *nadam va odatīnām* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) is by its syllables[2] an *usnih*, but by its feet an *anustubh*. *Uṣṇih* is life, *anustubh* speech. Thus he places speech and life in him. By repeating the first verse thrice, the verses become twenty-five. The trunk is the twenty-fifth, Prajāpati is the twenty-fifth. He has ten fingers, ten

[2] That is RV, X, 120, 1[a], with ten syllables, and VIII, 69, 2[a], with seven. He adds *pu* to them.

[3] Cf I, 1, 2 ad fin.

[4] i e. animals and vegetables (Sāyana)

[5] i e. ten syllables in RV, X, 120, 1[a], the syllable *pu*, and seven in VIII, 69, 2[a]. Similarly with the other three *padas*.

[6] (*śirasi*) *chidrani* is the version of Sayana and it is as probable as any other, though the word originally meant breath and only metaphorically is transferred to i's use as describing the organs of sense The nine 'orifices', seven in the head and two in the body, according to a Śruti (Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana, II, 5, 9, 10; 6, 8, is the reference, I think) cited by Sāyana (*sapta vai śirsanyah prānā dvav avañcau*), are referred to in the Kāṭhaka Upanisad, V, 1 (where in all, however, there are eleven), Śvetāśvatara Upanisad, III, 18, Yogaśikhā Upanisad, 4, Yogatattva Upanisad, 16, and elsewhere They are ears, eyes, mouth, nostrils and organs of evacuation, with the navel when ten are counted, as in the Jaiminiya Upaniṣad, and Jaiminiya Brāhmana, II, 77 (*J A O S.*, XV, 240), and *brahmarandhra* when eleven are counted Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p 243, E T, p 265; *Sechzig Upanishads*, p. 281, n. 1, and *nava vai śirasi prānah*, Sānkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 2, which points to a different idea, for which see I, 4, 1, n 5, 5, 1, n. 6, 2, n 13

[7] That is, after deducting the ten from the eighteen

[8] In his interesting note on relative clauses in the Veda, Edgren, *P. A O S*, May, 1883, pp xii-xv, points out that unlike Greek, Vedic Sanskrit uses the indef rel pronoun with the indic. This rule is not observed in the later Vedic literature, e.g Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sutra, I, 3, 1. *atha khalu yatra kva ca hotyan syat*, &c.

[1] i.e by the stanza, RV., VIII, 69, 2.

[2] It has four *padas*, and is therefore like an *anustubh*, which of course it really is. But it has in the Samhitā form only twenty seven syllables, or resolving the *y* in *aghnyanam* in *pāda* 3, twenty-eight, which is the number of syllables in an *usnih*, which, however, has three *pādas* (8 + 8 + 12) only

toes, two legs, two arms, and the trunk is the twenty fifth He adorns this trunk, the twenty fifth Further this day (of the sacrifice) is twenty-five, the *stoma* hymn of this day is twenty-five, like is brought about by like So the two are twenty-five This is the twenty fifth with regard to the body Now with regard to the deities The eye, ear, mind, speech, and vital spirits, these five deities[3] have entered into this person, and he has entered into these five deities He is then[4] pervaded wholly in all his limbs up to his hair and nails So all beings, down to ants, are born thus pervaded A Ṛṣi says (RV, X, 114, 8), 'A thousandfold are these fifteen members,'[5] for five arises from ten 'As large as heaven and earth, so large is it,' for the self is as large as heaven and earth. 'A thousandfold are the thousand mights,'[6] thus does the poet please and magnify the members 'As far as *brahman* extends so far does Vac,' wherever there is *brahman*, there is Vac,[7] wherever Vac, there is *brahman*, is what is meant The first[8] of these hymns has nine verses, for nine are the breaths, and it serves to win them The second has six verses, the seasons are six, and it serves to win them The third has five verses, the *pankti*[9] has five feet, and it is food, so it serves to win proper food Then comes a tristich, there are three threefold worlds, and it serves to conquer them These verses become *bṛhatīs*,[10] the

[3] Cf I, 3, 3 above II, 4 2

[4] 'Then' is taken by Max Muller as referring to the five deities, by Sayana as referring to the body in which *puruṣa* is. But the latter view seems quite sound The senses and *puruṣa* are absolutely inter connected For *saṅgaḥ*, cf Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, III, 3 3 For *ā* cf Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 88, *J A O S*, XXIII, 151 sq

[5] *uktha* Sayana translates *ukṛṣṭany aṅgāni* and, as hymns will not do he must be approximately right His view is that the fifteen are made up of the five above mentioned and the corresponding five elements (earth, water fire, wind, and ether) forming the mother and father But this is more than doubtful. For the ten the *atman* comes with its five organs and a complete body

[6] Because the senses are applied to a great variety of objects (Sayana)

[7] *Brahman* is in all and wherever a name is given, it is there, cf I, 3, 3. Sayana quotes a Śruti Taittiriya Āraṇyaka III, 12 *sarvāṇi rūpāṇi vicitya dhīraḥ* | *nāmāni kṛtvābhivadan yad āste* || For the very close connexion of *brahman* and *Vac*, see I, 1, 1, n 8, Atharvaveda, IV, 20, Bloomfield, *Atharvaveda*, p 89

[8] RV, X 120 has nine verses The repetition of *eṣām* is due, says Sayana, to the comparative nature of these hymns as used in the Śastra, the first *eṣām* refers to the hymns as they stand in the Śastra, the second to them alone as they stand in the Saṃhita. This is of course impossible For the nine *prāṇas*, see I 3 7, n 6 For the seasons, cf Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, pp 373, 374, Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI 184

[9] *annam ca pañktichandasa ṣ dhyat al kṣetreṣu pañktirūpeṇotpannatvād vā pañktirūpam*, Sayana. For the tristich and the worlds, cf. Śāṅkhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 3

[10] The first *pāda* of RV X, 120 1, has with *pra*, eleven syllables the first *pāda* of RV, VIII, 69 2, seven verses, making eighteen So two *pādas* give thirty six syllables or a *bṛhatī* The twenty three verses give forty six *bṛhatīs*, as each is extended similarly (Sayana)

metre, the immortal, the world of the gods. This is the body. Even so he who knows this comes by this way near to the undying self.[11]

## Adhyāya 4.

Then comes the *sūdadohas* verse.[1] *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then the neck verses.[2] They denote them as *uṣṇih* verses according to their metre. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse. *Sūdadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the head verses. They are in *gāyatrī*, for it is the beginning of the metres, and the head is the beginning of the members of the body.[3] They are in *arkavat*[4] verses. *Arka* is Agni. They are nine verses, the head is of nine pieces.[5] He recites the tenth verse. It is the skin and hairs of the head. It serves for reciting more than

[11] Sāyana explains this obscure statement as referring to a birth as a *deva*. It may be doubted if it means more than he comprehends the immortal body (cf. *ātmā*, just above), i.e. he who knows these verses thus performs that part of the rite which corresponds with the body of the bird to which the Niṣkevalya Śastra is likened (cf. I, 1, 1). That *ātmā* above means body or trunk seems certain, and the second *ātmānam* can hardly refer to anything else. If it does, it may simply mean, 'he becomes immortal.' The acc. is governed by *abhi*, cf. I, 1, 2, n. 10.

[1] The Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka treats all this very briefly, II, 1, covers all Adhyāya 3 and the *sudadohas*. The *śirsan* comes in II, 2, before the *grava*, II, 3, then the *pakṣau* (*akṣa*, *bāhū*, *prahastaka*), II, 4-5; then the *caturuttaraṇi*, II, 6, the *āśītis*, *gāyatrī*, *bārhatī*, *auṣṇihī*, II, 7-10, the *vaśa*, II, 11, the *dvipadaḥ*, II, 12, the *aindrāgna sūkta*, II, 13; the *avapana*, II, 14, the *ānuṣṭubha samamnāya*, II, 15; the *triṣṭupchata*, II, 16, then two miscellaneous chapters, II, 17, 18.

*Sudadohas* is interpreted as yielding milk and it represents the verse, RV., VIII, 69, 3, *tā́ asya sūdadohasaḥ sómam śrīṇanti pṛ́śnayaḥ | jánman devā́nāṃ víśas triṣv ā́ rocané divá́ḥ ||* This is the verse immediately after the *nada* verse. Its use here is explained by Sāyana because it is *prāṇasvarūpā*. Cf. Śaṅkhāyana, II, 1: *imāni parvāṇi saṃhitāni bhavanti*. *parvan* is apparently used vaguely; cf. I, 2, 3, n. 12.

[2] For them see V, 2, 1, which is expressly here ascribed to Śaunaka by Sāyana, Introd., p. 20. *grīvāḥ* here means 'cervical cartilages', see n. 7.

[3] *sisṛkṣoḥ Prajāpateḥ prathamaṃ mukhato gāyatrī samutpannā* (Sāyana quoting the Yajurbrāhmana), see Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 18, 53.

[4] That is, RV., I, 7, 1-9; in v. 1 *arkebhir* occurs.

[5] Cf. Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VI, 2, 1: *tasmān navadhā śiro viṣyūtam* | (Sāyana); *nava vai śirasi prāṇāḥ*, Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 2, and I, 3, 7, n. 6. The first expression of this precise idea seems to be in the Atharvaveda, X, 8, 43: *puṇḍárīkaṃ návadvāram tribhír guṇébhir ā́vṛtam*. Whitney in his *Translation*, p. 601, thinks that the later *gunas* are already referred to, but as Lanman (*Translation*, p. 1045) points out, Garbe (*Saṃkhyatattvakaumudī*, *Abh. der Bayerischen Ak. der Wiss.*, XIX, 529) renders the three coverings as skin and nails and hair (cf. n. 6). A different view of the *prāṇas* appears in Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā (XXVIII, 3, cited by Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113, n. 2 for a grammatical point): *daśa vai puruṣe prāṇāḥ stanau dvādaśau* (= 11th and 12th). Cf. also Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, II, 15.

the *stoma*[6] These form the *trivrt stoma* and the *gāyatri* metre, and it is after the production of this *stoma* and this metre that there arises all that is These verses serve for production. Children and cattle are his who knows this. Next comes the *sudadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Then come the vertebrae verses[7] They are in *virāj* metre So one man says to another, 'Thou shinest above us,' or, 'Thou bearest a high neck,' to one who is proud[8] Or, again, because they run[9] close[10] together, they

[6] In the *trivrt stoma* only nine verses of the hymn are used, but here the tenth verse of the hymn is also employed. This is not the case in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 2 Sayana cites Taittiriya Brahmana, I, 2, 6 *trivrc chiro bhavati* | *tredhā vihitam hi siras* | *loma chavir asthi paraca stuvanti* | Cf also Śāṅkhāyana, l c. *trini va asya sirsnah kapalani bhavanti*, Śatapatha Brahmana, XIV, 3, 1, 19.

[7] *usyavah* is taken by Sayana as a masculine singular, he derives it from *vislesena javah*, and calls it the part at the root of the wings, or, taking it perhaps as plural, from *vyu*, the lower bones of the neck It is most probably a plural. Max Muller's dictum that *ta virya* proves nothing as it must be attracted goes too far The exact sense of *visyavah* is doubtful But as *grivah* is plural and properly means 'the cervical cartilages' or windpipe, the front part of the neck, then most probably *usyavah* is also plural and denotes the back part of the neck, the cervical vertebrae, which are usually denoted by *skandhyah* (Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1906, p 918, 1907, pp 1, 2) This gives a perfectly good sense and seems imperatively demanded by the allusion below to a stiffnecked man, in the proverb *grivah* is used (in a way which spoils the argument formally), either (*a*) as neck generally or (*b*) as cervical vertebrae, a sense found in the Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 4, 10 (Hoernle, p. 918). The *grivah* of the Āranyaka must, however, be different from the *usyavah* Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII 112, n 1) takes *usyavah* as 'the roots (sinews) of the wings' (cf. Bohtlingk and Monier-Williams, *Dict*, s. v ) and Friedlander (Introd, p. 10) translates 'Flugelansatz

For *tā virya bhavanti*, if it is, as is not likely, attracted, cf. examples in Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 564-566, Chāndogya Upanisad, VI, 16, 2 *etad ātmyam idam sarvam tat satyam sa ātma*, *infra* II, 6 1, and for Sanskrit, Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 27 Examples, however, on non-attraction are found when needed to make plain the sense, e g the Chāndogya passage cited has *tat tvam asi* and so passim in the Upanisads (see Jacob's *Concordance*, p. 137) The use is very old, being found in Greek and Latin also Cf. below, II, 1, 2 *esa vā rg esa*, &c.; *esa vai padam*, &c. A case or two seems to occur of the reverse attraction, e g Maitrāyanī Upanisad, I, 2 : *etad vrttam purastad duhsakyam etat prasnam*, where see, however, Max Muller's note (*S B E*, XV, 288, n 1)

[8] This is the translation adopted by Max Muller from Sāyana. This may be correct, but the passage would certainly run better if it were taken all as one sentence 'So one man says to another, "Thou shinest above us, thou bearest indeed a stiff neck," that is to one who is proud' But the position of *stabhamānam vā* renders this doubtful On the other hand Sāyana feels that it is difficult to explain the *grivā vai dhārayasi* if taken alone, and this seems to me to turn the balance in favour of the translation here suggested For this meaning of *grivah* see Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 4, 10, and Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1906, pp 916-921 Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 2 *trini vā asmin grivānām parvani bhavanti*

[9] *dutah* must be from √*du gatau* (Dhātupātha, XXII, 46) as Sāyana says. Monier-Williams' *Dict* omits this form giving *davisani*, RV, X, 34 5, as the only quotable form (see v Schroeder, *Vienna Oriental Journal*, XIII, 119 121) v Schroeder (ibid., 297, 298) finds the same root with *upa* + *ā* in the sense 'anlegen' in Kāthaka Samhitā, VI, 2 *kāksa upādutyah*, and

are taken to be[11] the best food For *viraj* is food, and food strength Next comes the *sudadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints

2 Now comes the right wing It is this world,[1] it is this Agni, it is speech, it is the Rathantara, it is Vasistha, it is a hundred[2] These are the six powers of it. The *sampāta* hymn serves to win desires and for firmness The *pankti* verse serves for proper food Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints Then follows the left wing It is that world, it is that sun, it is mind,[3] it is the Bṛhat, it is Bharadvaja, it is a hundred[4] These are the six powers of it The *sampāta* hymn serves to

Kapiṣṭhala Samhita IV, 1 *laksa upadultjah* and compares Greek δύω ἐνδύω, ἐκδύω and Latin *induo, exuo* Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 98) still treats *davisani* as if it meant 'I will play', as taken by Geldner (*Sieben zig Lieder*, pp 158 sq) It cannot be from √*du* 'burn', as suggested doubtfully in Whitney, *Roots &c*, p 75

[10] *sambṛḍhatamaḥ* is clearly the reading, from √*bamh* (i e *bṛḍha* for *baḍha*) It occurs in the Taittirīya Āranyaka Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 951, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 58, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 44

[11] *annatamam pratyacyante* is thus construed by Max Müller who says the adverbial form is vouched for by Panini, V 4, 11 The free use of comparatives and superlatives of this class is a sign of early style but in the earliest literature (RV and AV) the accusative neuter is preferred, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* §§ 1111 e, and 1119 Cf also Śatapatha Brahmana, X 1, 2, 5 *alamam khyayate* ibid, X, 4, 2, 10 *anutamam gopayati* and Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 194, *pratarani iva kriyante*, Aitareya Brahmana III 48, 4 *te natarām pāpmanam apahata*, Aitareya Brahmana, IV, 25, 3 But none of these or similar cases seem to justify *annatamam*, and the sense given by Sayana as *prapyante* would equally be obtained by rendering 'they approximate towards (*prati* + √*ac*) that which is most truly food' (fem. because *viraj* is fem) For such a use of *annatama* cf RV, II 41, 16 (*ambitame naditame, devitame*), and many examples in Delbruck, l c, p 193 and for the acc cf *abhisat padyante* with acc. I 1, 2, n 10 The acc. is governed by the preposition *yad* may be taken with *dutah* as equivalent to a finite verb which is not very probable, or with *pratyacyante*, as giving the explanation of 'the *rṣiyaḥ* are *viraj*'

[1] Agni is the guardian of this world and he is also Vac, II 4 2 and Vac is Rathantara, III, 1, 6 (Sayana) while Vasiṣṭha brought the Rathantara

[2] See V 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV VII 32 22 and 23 VIII 3 7 and 8 (three each according to the reckoning of the Aranyaka) I 32 (15 vv), VII 18 1-15, VII, 19 (11 vv), 20 (10 vv), 23 (6 vv), 25-29 (26 vv), IV, 20 (11 vv), making 100 in all, and then the *pankti*, I, 80, 1, IV, 20, is styled the *sampāta* hymn

[3] The moon is the deity of mind, but here the identity of sun and moon is meant, says Sayana, and *manas* is Bṛhat, and Bharadvāja made the Bṛhat

[4] See V, 2, 2 for the verses. They are RV, VI 46, 1 and 2 VIII, 61, 7 and 8 (three each according to this reckoning), VI, 18 (15 vv), 23 (10 vv), 24 (10 vv), 25 (9 vv) 31-38 (40 vv), IV, 23 (11 vv), making 101 in all, and then the *pankti* I 81, 1 The *sampāta* is IV, 23, cf Aitareya Brāhmana IV, 30, 2 The *šatam* is not precisely accurate, but the inaccuracy is deliberate There are 100 in the right and 101 in the left, and the *pankti* verse adds one to each of them For the varying sizes of the wings see Taittirīya Brāhmana, I, 2, 6 3

man desires and for firmness The *pankti* verse serves for proper food These two are deficient and excessive The Brhad is male, the Rathantara is female The excess is of the male the deficiency of the female Therefore are they deficient and excessive Now by one feather is the left wing of the bird the better and therefore the left wing is the better by one verse Next comes the *sudadohas* verse *Sudadohas* is breath and by breath he joins together all joints. Then follows the tail This consists of twenty one *dvipada* verses[5] For twenty one are the backward feathers of the bird Again of all *stomas* is the *ekavimsa* the support, and the tail the support of all birds He recites a twenty second verse This is given the form of two supports[6] So all birds support themselves on their tails and having supported themselves on their tails they fly up For the tail is a support. He (the bird) is supported by two decades of *viraj* verses He again, the man is supported by these two *dvipadas* the twenty first and twenty-second That which forms the bird serves to obtain the desires of the man That which forms the man serves for his prosperity, glory, proper food, and honour Next comes the *sudadohas* verse next an additional verse, next the *sudadohas* verse The *sudadohas* is male the additional verse female Therefore he recites the *sudadohas* verse on either side of the additional verse Therefore the seed of the two when effused obtains oneness with regard to the woman alone So birth takes place in and from the woman Therefore he recites the additional verse in that way[7]

3 He recites the eighty *gayatri* tristichs[1] The eighty *gayatri* tristichs are this world and whatever glory, might[2] wedlock proper food, and honour there is in this world may I obtain it may I win it may I possess it may it be mine

[5] These verses RV X 157 (5 vv) 172 (4 vv) besides twelve from other Śakhas are given in V 2 2 Cf Taittiriya Brahmana I 2 6, 4 *ekavimśam pṛṣṭham | dvipadā s stuvanti pratiṣṭhityai* |

[6] The feet Sayana says The idea seems to be when there are twenty two verses, that twenty represent the feet of the bird and two those of the man When twenty one it is the tail that is in question See also V 2 2

[7] *atra* is rendered *asmin viṣaya vibhāge* in Sayana It seems rather to refer to the position of the additional verse between the *sudadohas* For *abhi* in the Aitareya Brahmana cf Liebich *Bezz Beitr* XI 281 Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 88 *Ito atas* (Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1098) is possible and must be so taken if *ajanana* is a noun as given in Bohtlingk and Monier Williams *Dict* But it is simpler to take it and *pra*° as adjectives. Cf II 1 2 *prthivi tah* where *stah* is probably meant Cf *ajanayah* in Taittiriya Upanisad II, 8 (*S B E*, XV 61 n 2) *ajanadevah* Jacob *Concordance* p. 162 For the *ekakesa* see Weber *Ind Stud* X 142 n 3 XIII 113 n 1 Bolling *J A O S* XXIII 321 sq

[1] The three sets of tristichs are the food of the bird They are set forth in detail in V, 2 3 4, 5 respectively

[2] Might is interpreted by Sayana as *vedaśāstraprayuktā pūjā* and is opposed to *apacitiḥ* as *dhanadhānyādi samṛddhau pūjā* but he gives *tejas* as an alternative rendering

Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all this world He recites the eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs The eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs are the sky world, and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in the sky-world, may I obtain it, may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine. Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all the world He recites the eighty *uṣṇih* tristichs The eighty *uṣṇih* tristichs are that world, heaven,[3] and whatever glory, might, wedlock, proper food, and honour there is in that world, and the divinity of the gods,[4] may I obtain it,[5] may I win it, may I possess it, may it be mine[6] Next comes the *sudadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he links together all that world

## Adhyāya 5

He recites the *vaśa*[1] hymn desiring all to be in his power There are twenty-one[2] verses, for twenty-one are the parts in the stomach. Then the *ekaviṃśa* is the support of all *stomas* and the stomach the support of proper foods They are in different metres For the intestines are larger one than the other,[3] some small,

[3] The insertion of *dyaus* is curious and Sayana notes it as being *viśpaṣṭārtham*

[4] This is taken by Sayana as being equal to *brahman* the honoured of the gods, Indra, &c, and he quotes for it a passage intended to be Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, VI, 7 *tam īśvarāṇāṃ paramaṃ maheśvaraṃ taṃ devānāṃ paramaṃ daivatam* (so I., read with S *devatānām* (or *daivatānām* with ed ) *paramaṃ ca daivatam*) But, though Max Muller accepts this view, it is simpler to equate it merely to the divinity of the gods, i e the divine nature

[5] Probably *apnavam* is suggested by the *aś* of *aśiti* equated to √*aś*, as stated by Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 112, n 1) The view that *aśiti* contains the √*aś*, eat, probably led to the identification of the *aśitis* with *anna* as throughout the Āraṇyaka and also in Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 5, 2, 17, but when Sāyana in his commentary on this passage calls the *aśitis annarūpāḥ* he merely refers, I think, to that identification and does not base it on etymology, as suggested by Eggeling

[6] For the subjunctive as optative in sense, cf Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 186 and for the question of subj and opt, Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, App I For subjunctives in Aitareya Brahmana see Aufrecht, pp 429 430, and a full list in Bohtlingk, *Chrestomathie*[2], pp 349 350 See also Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 306 sq, *Vergl Syntax*, II, 365 sq

[1] In Sankhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 11, the *sudadohas* verse is repeated twenty four times It agrees in counting the *vaśa* hymn as referring to the *udara* The hymn is RV, VIII, 46 See I, 2 5 It is called a *maviā* in I, 5, 2 below The name is given because the author is Vaśa (Aśvya) says Sayana and this is probably the case, showing the early date of the traditional authorships Cf Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, VIII, 6, 2 3, and Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 112, n 2. See also Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XLII, 215 sq

[2] Only twenty of RV, VIII, 46, but the *sūdadohas* verse is counted in, see, however, on V, 2, 5 ad fin

[3] *Vikṣudram* is rendered 'confused' by Max Müller The rendering in the text is that of Sayana and is supported by the use of *vikṣudra iva hi paśavaḥ* in Aitareya Brahmana, V, 6, 5,

some big He recites them with the word *om* according to the metre and according to the manner of the occurrence[4] For the intestines are as it were according to the manner of their occurrence, some shorter, some longer Next comes the *sūdadohas* verse *Sūdadohas* is breath, and by breath he joins together all joints. Having recited this verse twelve times,[5] he leaves off Twelvefold are these breaths,[6] seven in the head, two in the breast, three below There are they contained, there are they perfected Therefore there[7] he leaves off The hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), forms the two thighs which belong to Indra and Agni,[8] the two supports with broad bones The

where see Sayana's explanation For the compar, see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 196 sq The *hṛdaya* is *sthūla* according to Sayana The metres of RV, VIII, 46, are very various in the eyes of the Anukramani For the form *antastya*, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1245 c The twenty transverse processes (*kuntapa*) in the abdominal portion of the spine (*udara*), Śatapatha Brahmana XII, 2, 4, 11, 14 (Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIV, 164, n 1, Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907, pp 8, 10) suggest a different rendering, but the tradition is quite plausible The epithet used too does not suit bones It is, however, to be noted that in Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, II, 6, the *anūka* which can mean the lumbar portion of the spine (RV, VI, 163, 2, cited by Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1906, p 917) as well as the thoracic portion (Śatapatha Brahmana, XII 2, 4, 14 cited ibid, 1907, p 9) is said to have twenty-one *parvans*, and certainly this is so strikingly parallel to the *udara* with its twenty *kuntapas* (Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 2, 4, 12), since the twenty first may be the *anuka* itself, that it is possible that this passage should be so interpreted. But to do so would only be justified by the belief that these early medical statements rest, as Hoernle (*Osteology*, pp 101-109) holds, on acquaintance with current medical views, an opinion I do not share for reasons given in *Z D M G*, LXII, 134 sq

[4] *yathopapāditam* is a difficult phrase Max Muller, following Sāyana, renders 'according to rule' Sayana explains this with reference to the technical rule, given by Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra VI, 5, 11, 12, that *dvipada* verses are to be recited with a pause in the middle and *om* at the end, while *ekapada* verses are to have *om* prefixed and affixed This is artificial and perhaps it only means (cf Monier Williams' *Dict*, s v) 'just as it may happen', which version suits the *antastyam* better, and Sayana ends up with practically this version *Chandaskāram* (for the Sandhi, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 340, Aufrecht *Aitareya Brahmana* p 420, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 71) refers of course to the different metres of the hymn Cf V, 2, 5, and note For the gerund, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 995, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 401 sq, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 224

[5] That is once each in the verses representing the body, neck, head, vertebrae, right side, left side, tail, food in three sets of eighty tristichs, and the *vaśa* hymn In the case of the tail there is a *sudadohas* before and one after the additional verse, and so the number twelve is made up

[6] The number twelve is clearly to suit the twelve repetitions of the *sudadohas* verse It is probably got by taking the seven openings in the head, I, 3 7, 8, and adding the two in the breasts, and the *nābhi*, *pāyu* and *guda* For other fanciful enumerations cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp 255 sq, E.T, pp 283 sq, and Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmana cited in note 6 on I, 3 7

[7] He does not use that verse in the 'thigh' verses.

[8] Indra and Agni are the strongest of gods and the thighs enable the bird to fly aloft (Sāyana). In Śāṅkhāyana these verses form part of what represents the tail in the Aitareya, but

verses have six feet[9] for firmness Man[10] has a double support, cattle have four feet So he places the sacrificer with his double support among the four-footed cattle. The second verse has seven feet,[11] and he makes it into a *gāyatrī* and an *anuṣṭubh* Now the *gāyatrī*[12] is *brahman*, the *anuṣṭubh* is Vac, and so he unites Vac and *brahman* He recites[13] a *triṣṭubh* at the end The *triṣṭubh* is strength and so with strength he surrounds animals. Therefore animals[14] depend on strength for their rising and their going forth

2 In the Niskevalya hymn addressed to Indra,[1] 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV, X, 50), he inserts a *nivid*[2] For clearly thus does he place strength in himself They are *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs*[3] They say, 'Why then does he insert a *nivid* among *triṣṭubhs* and *jagatīs*?'[4] 'One metre only

in Satapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3, they are referred to the wings, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 111, 112 See also V, 3, 1, n 1, above, p 37

[9] They, except two and twelve, are in the so-called *mahapankti* metre For the correct expression *urvasthīve*, cf the use of *uruphalaka* for the thighs, Hoernle, *Osteology*, pp 206, 215, perhaps wrongly read for *uru*° If *uru*° is read here, it means 'the thighs and knees are supports', cf Vajasaneyi Samhita, XVIII, 23, Āpastamba Śulba Sutra, XI, 2 and 3 (*Z D M G*, LVI, 362)

[10] Cf I, 1, 2, n 5

[11] It consists of seven *pādas* of eight syllables and can be made into an *anuṣṭubh* preceded by a *gāyatrī* According to Sayana, following Aśvalayana, in the latter case there is a pause after the second *pada*, and *om* after the third In the former the *om* follows the fourth, and there is a pause after the second *pada*

[12] Cf I, 1, 1, n 8

[13] Sayana holds this to refer to a special mode of recitation, by which after the first *pāda* there is a pause, and *om* follows the second, and so for the third and fourth, and which he calls *triṣṭupsamaya* This is from Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, VI, 15 6, RV, VIII 40 12 is an *triṣṭubh*

[14] This must mean, as Sayana says, and as Max Muller takes it that animals obey a master The last two accusatives are loosely connected as accusatives of point in which, such acc are more frequent in Greek and Latin (e g Tacitus *Ann*, I 27 *deserunt tribunal manus intentantes, causam discordiae et initium armorum*) In the Maitreya Upanisad (Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, xlv) *sa tatra paramam tapa adityam udīksamana urdhvas tisthati* Max Muller observes that *asthāya* would be expected but it is not necessary to suspect the text For the compound, cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 47 and 48 In *patum parigachati* the acc is dependent on *pari* so Aitareya Brāhmana, VIII, 28, 1, 2, *tam etah pañca devatah parimriyante* (correct Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 88)

[1] Forming part of the thigh verses

[2] Sayana says the *nivid* (cf Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad III, 9, 1, for a Vaisvadeva *nivid*) is to come after the fourth verse and is to be *Indro devah somam pibatu* (*pinnamanah* S), &c (Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, VIII, 17, 1) 'In himself' he renders as 'in the bird in the shape of the Śastra' It may mean 'in himself' only For the *nivids* see Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp 136 sq The *nivitsanjñake granthe* in R is unhappily, a myth, the reading (in R[2], S, &c) is *sanghe*

[3] The metre is irregular According to the Anukramanī, one and seven are *jagatī*, the rest *triṣṭubh* Sāyana offers the alternative of the last two being *jagatī*

[4] The *prakṛti* has *triṣṭubhs* at the midday pressing and so the deviation needs explanation Note that the answer is repeated, and is not that of the Aranyaka itself, though it is adopted.

cannot support or fill the *nivid* of this day,' so he inserts the *nivid* among *tristubhs* and *jagatis*. Let him know that this day has three *nivids*[5] The *tarksya* hymn is a *nivid*, the Vālakhilyas are a *nivid*, and the *nivid* is a *nivid*. So let him know that there are three *nivids* in this day Then come the hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been put down' (RV, X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12) In these is the verse, 'When the hopes of all are on food' (RV., X, 29, 4), and it serves to win proper food Then comes an insertion. As many decades of verses[6] in *tristubh* and *jagati* addressed to Indra as they insert between these two hymns, after transforming them into *brhatis*, so many years do they live beyond the normal life[7] By this insertion life is gained Next he recites the *sajanya*[8] hymn that cattle may come to his offspring Then he recites the Tarksya[9] hymn Tārksya is welfare, and the hymn leads to welfare Thus he procures welfare. He recites

[5] Sayana says the *nivid* here referred to above is the *mukhya nivid*, and the others are *aupacarike*, and he assigns the use of several metres in the *vala* and of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* in the Valakhilyas as the reason for their being styled *nivids* The Valakhilyas occur in the *brhati* tr stichs see V 2,4 The Valakhilyas and Nivids are printed from the Kašmir MS by Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, 1906 See also Oldenberg *Gott gel Anz*, 1907 Scheftelowitz (pp 10 sq) argues that the Valakhilyas are among the old Khilas which were accepted by some schools (probably the Baskala and Mandukeya) and not by others (Śakalya), who only included 'Nationalhymnen in their tradition Oldenberg (pp 221–235) effectually—in my opinion—demolishes this argument and leaves the Khilas what they have hitherto been considered, later additions to the Rgvedic tradition, though doubtless in themselves old The Valakhilyas are mentioned by that name in Kausitaki Brahmana, XXX, 8, Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 23 Maitrayani Upanisad, II, 3, &c Cf also Macdonell on *Brhaddevata* VI 48, III 116 Max Muller, *Marut Hymns*, pp. xxxiii sq, who is, however, wrong in saying that they do not occur in any Khila collection, *St Petersburg Dict*, VI 954

[6] Sayana renders *dašat nam* as 'taken from the ten thousand numbered Samhita', and Max Muller takes it as 'taken from the ten Mandalas' Neither meaning appears certain *dašati* elsewhere means a decade, *dašatayi* refers to the Samhitā and I think *dašatinam* must mean decades. They are decades of *tristubhs* and *jagatis* turned into *brhatis*, and it may be noted that six *tristubhs* and two *jagatis* give ten *brhatis* This may be the reference, or the reference may be to the fact that three *tristubhs* and seven *jagatis* give thirteen *brhatis* Sāyana contents himself with explaining that of three *tristubhs* and four *jagatis* nine *brhatis* can be made which does not seem to be of much help V, 3 1, appears to support the view here taken

[7] That is, no doubt, one hundred years, V, 3, 1, and I, 2, 2, n 14 For *ā ūkram* with abl, cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 58, 90, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 113, Liebich, *Bezz Beitr*, XI 295

[8] That is, RV, II, 12, called *sajaniyam* in Aitareya Brāhmana, V, 2, 1 For *arjayan* cf Speijer, l c, § 188, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 587 Delbruck, pp. 353 sq The form is given by Whitney, *Roots, &c*, p 14, as only found in the Sūtras and Epic

[9] RV, X, 178, addressed, says Sayana, to Tarksya Garuda, but cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p 145 R reads *Tark o* but the Sarvānukramani and Brhaddevatā agree with the RV Cf Kausitaki Brahmana, XXX, 5, and III, 2, 6, n 5 For the form, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 233 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 43

the *ekapada*[10] verse that he may at once be all and win all the metres[11] In the hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11), there are additions[12] to the verses Seven verses does he make additions to For seven are the breaths[13] in the head, and so does he place breaths in the head He makes no addition to the eighth The eighth is speech, and (he thinks), 'Let not speech be mingled with my breaths' Therefore speech, though it has the same abode as the breaths, is not mingled with them He recites the *virāj* verses[14] *Virāj* verses are food, and serve to win food He ends with the hymn of Vasistha,[15] that he may become Vasistha (He should end) with the perfect verse,[16] with the word 'great' in it, 'This praise to the great, the terrible, the bearer' (RV, VII, 24, 5) In the verse, 'Like a steed labouring at the yoke, he has taken his place' (RV, VII, 24, 5) the yoke is the end (of the car) This day is the end[17] Thus is (the verse) fit for the day (He should end) with the perfect verse, with the word 'praise' in it, 'O Indra, this praise celebrates thee' (RV, VII, 24, 5c) With regard to the verse, 'As heaven over

[10] Sayana gives it as *Indro visvam virajati*, see V, 3, 1

[11] It is the last of the metres used

[12] The phrase occurs also in Śankhayana Āranyaka, II, 12, and is further explained in V, 3, 1, where Sāyana is much more explicit than in his commentary here The idea is 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 1d, 2b, 2c, 3a, 2d, 3b, and so on The result is a curious intertwining *vyatisanga*, of verses A similar proceeding is found in Aitareya Brahmana, IV, 3 VI, 24 For other examples of this process, called *viharana* also, cf Sankhayana Śrauta Sutra, VII, 15, 4 (at the Āpyayana of the Madhyandina Savana), IX, 5, 4 (at the Sodaśin), XII, 11 5, and Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sutra, VIII, 2, 7 (Valakhilyas, when a *vyatimarśam viharana* takes place), Roth, *Z D M G*, XXXVII, 109, who traces the practice even in the Rgveda, and Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 103

[13] The openings are referred to above, I, 3, 7, 8 4 1, 5, 1 The eighth as Vāc refers no doubt to the tongue The first reference to seven openings is not (as Deussen seems to hold) that in Atharvaveda X, 8, 9, which is there practically unintelligible and which is given up by Whitney (*Translation* p 597) but which appears in a more plausible form in Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, II, 2, 3, where the verse has as its last *pada* '*vag astami brahmana samvidana*, but that in AV, X, 2, 6, where the seven *khani* are given as eyes, nostrils, ears and mouth (see Whitney, *Translation*, p 568, Hoernle, *J R A S*, 1907 p 12) In ver 7 the tongue is specially mentioned The seven, however, seem already to have included Vac, to judge from the explanation in that Upanisad, II, 2, 4, where, according to Deussen's translation, it is intended to stand for the tongue, as indeed seems clear from its being connected with Atri and *atti*, though Böhtlingk, in his translation, p 26, takes it otherwise Sayana here refers to the other *pranas* as *jihvatvagadibhih* Vac apparently then is little more than a duplicate Cf I, 3, 7, n 6 For the seven *pranas*, cf also Śatapatha Brahmana, IX, 5, 2, 8

[14] RV, VII, 22, 1-6, see V, 3 1

[15] RV, VII, 24 For the word *iṣha* in ver 5, see Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 135

[16] The sixth verse is placed after the fourth and the fifth comes at the end, V, 3, 1

[17] The last day is the *udayaniyatiratra* For *dhuh*, cf RV, II, 2, 1 *dhuksidam* 'charioteer', Hopkins, *J A O S*, XIII 237 sq

heaven,[38] give us glory' (RV, VII, 24, 5d), wherever the speech of the Brahmin[39] is uttered, this is his glory, when he who knows ends with this verse. So let him who knows this end with this verse

[38] Sāyana renders, 'as in heaven so in the worlds (the *maharloka*, &c) above the heaven!' The same *maharloka* is dragged in to explain II, 4, 1

[39] Sāyana vaguely says *vedasambandhi vakyam* But I think there is a clear reference to the speech of the Brahmins The opposition is probably as yet mainly to non Aryan tongues, cf Tāndya Mahabrahmana, XVII, 1, 2, 9 Whatever be the history of Vedic and Sanskrit, it is difficult to believe at this date (800–700 B C) in very much development of Prakritic forms so as to render contrast with them natural though no doubt such forms existed (Cf the discussions in *J R A S*, 1903, pp 435 sq) See also I, 3, 1, n 5, III, 2, 5, Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 1, 23 with Eggeling's note on the Kānva reading, Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 20–24, Lanman's notes on Whitney, *Atharvaveda*, III, 12, 4, X, 9, 23; XII, 4 4, XIX, 8, 4, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I xviii. The Atharvan passages point to the possibility that some of the Prakritic forms are due to the later tradition and are no evidence for the time of the Atharva. Similar considerations are familiar in the Homeric question see especially Monro, *Odyssey*, XIII–XXIV, Appendix, pp 455–484 The early date of the Epic if adopted (cf my notes, *J R A S*, 1906, pp 1 sq, 1907, pp 681–683) would bear out the view that Prakrit was not so early as has been claimed (cf Franke, *Pali und Sanskrit* (1902), pp 49 sq) the ruling speech of the people No doubt the Mantra literature represents a poetic diction (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 38 sq) but it has not yet been made even plausible that contemporaneous with it were really Prakritic dialects, though no doubt in certain cases the tendencies which produced Prakrit were already in full force The subsequent history is doubtless that of the more and more marked separation of the literary and the vulgar speech (cf Delbruck's neat summary of the history, *Altindischer Verbum*, pp 3 sq) and the place of the Epic must (it seems to me) be found either before the decay of speech had rendered the Sanskrit unintelligible to the warrior classes of the populace—and the Epic appears in origin to have been precisely like the Homeric Epic (see Lang, *Homer and His Age*, 1906) poetry composed by poets at the courts of princes who sang to the retainers and friends of their patron—not of course an epic of the lower classes or the mere cultivator, though he would understand it in part—or after the general revival of Sanskrit in the second and third centuries A D The latter view seems to raise more serious difficulties in our conception of the history of language and literature than it can pretend to solve I still think the earliest epic (as distinguished from mere *ākhyanas* or *itihasas*) must date from the eighth to sixth centuries B C and be contemporaneous with the Brahmanas and Aranyakas, though of course in the case of both Mahabharata and Ramayana extensive additions have been made by priestly hands in the two or three centuries before the Christian era. Only thus can a real place be found for Panini's *bhāsa*, or for the custom of the Drama which must represent a real state of affairs when Sanskrit could be used by kings and nobles as intelligible to their inferiors. For what Ksatriyas spoke in the eighth to sixth centuries B C. we have no evidence save the Brahmanas, where they speak Sanskrit, and the Epic, so far as we can regard it as contemporaneous In view of the fact that Patañjali knew the Drama (*Ind Stud*, XIII, 486 sq), it seems only reasonable to assign to his period the separate use of Sanskrit and Prakrit for the different characters and either then or earlier the state of affairs must have been real Nor is it possible to accept the theory of Lévi, Barth, and Grierson (*Ind Ant.*, XXIII, 110) that an originally Prakrit drama was turned into Sanskrit This theory leaves no plausible explanation open of the use of Prakrit for some characters, since *ex hypothesi* both men and women equally used Prākrit in conversation, and, while it is quite intelligible that after the drama was an

3 'We choose that of Savitr' (RV, V, 82, 1–3) and 'O god, Savitr, this day' (RV, V, 82, 4–6), are the strophe and antistrophe (of the Vaiśvadeva hymn[1]) and are perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial[2] Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the Vaiśvadeva)[3] is the atonement Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (the Vaiśvadeva) as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites this Vaiśvadeva Then comes the Savitr hymn, 'Of Savitr, the god, this great and desirable thing' (RV, IV, 53) Great[4] is the end This day is the end So the verse fits this day. Then comes the Dyavā-Pṛthivī hymn, 'Which is the elder, which the younger' (RV, I, 185), in which (the verses) end alike[5] This day is one on which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits the day Then comes the Ṛbhu hymn, 'Born not for steeds nor reins, worthy of praise' (RV, IV, 36) With regard to the words, 'The chariot of three wheels,' the hymn is possessed of three (*trivat*), and what is possessed of three[6] is the end This day is the end So the hymn fits the day The hymn, 'Of this benignant, greyhaired, priest' (RV, I, 164), addressed to

established fact it could remain popular long after it had ceased to be intelligible the popularity of a literary form *ex initio* unread is very strange People in England would not go to Italian opera (which by the by is certainly understood by fifty per cent of the spectators), but for the fact that there was once and still is a popular drama in England

Of course it cannot be contended—nor is it so claimed—that Sanskrit was ever the vernacular of the lower classes What we have to conceive is rather a parallel series of languages diverging from vernaculars older than the Vedic of the earliest hymns, each current among certain portions of the people, but in their earlier stages intelligible to all The Greek and English dialects give a fair parallel, in both cases ending in a common form of educated and literary speech. Cf Jacobi *Z D M G*, XLVIII 407 sq

[1] Cf Sankhayana Āraṇyaka, II, 18, which differs in detail as usual This section refers to the evening Soma pressing, when the Vaiśvadeva and Āgnimaruta Śastras are recited, see Weber, *Ind Stud*, X, 353, 354 n 3, Eggeling *S B E* XXVI, 325, 361 (Vaiśvadeva), 369 (Āgnimaruta) Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma*, pp 354 sq

[2] The *prakrti* is here the Viśvajit, and the *mulaprakrti* the Agniṣṭoma, as usual

[3] Cf I, 2, 1 Sayana selects the two tristichs as the immediate point of reference

[4] Because greatness is the *ne plus ultra* of all things (Sayana)

[5] *udarka* is equal to *anta* in the one case and to *uttarakale eva bhavi phalam* in the other, according to Sāyana. The sacrificers obtain *brahman*, he adds, but this is hardly meant. Most of the verses end alike in this and the following cases Cf for the word, Aitareya Brāhmana, V, 1, 3, 12

[6] This is not obvious. Sayana refers it to the case where two wheels are inadequate and a third is found necessary This wheel, as before the *dhuḥ*, is the end, I, 5, 2 Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, pp viii, ix) points out that *tricakra* in the Samhitās is merely an epithet of the cars of the Aśvins where its sense is mythological and he therefore denies the existence of three wheeled cars in the Vedic period, but cf Weber, *I erl Sit*, 1898, p 564 n 1

the All gods, is multiform [7] This day is multiform So the hymn fits the day (Of what he recites) the end [8] is, 'Forming the waters, the buffalo hath lowed' (RV, I, 164, 41) The hymn, 'May powers auspicious come to us on every side' (RV, I, 89) addressed to the All gods, is one containing an insertion, and is perfect in form as belonging to the one day ceremonial Much indeed is done on this day that is forbidden and (the hymn with the insertion [9]) is the atonement Now atonement is rest, and so at the end (of the sacrifice) the sacrificers rest on the atonement of the one day (insertion) as their rest He rests who knows this, and they also rest for whom the Hotr priest who knows this recites the hymn with the insertion The verses 'To Vaisvanara, who strengthens law, our praise' (RV, III, 2, 1 sq) are the strophe of the Āgnimāruta Śastra Praise is the end This day is the end So the hymn fits the day The hymn, 'The Maruts, rushing onward, with gleaming lances' (RV, V, 55) addressed to the Maruts, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day He recites, before the next hymn, the verse, 'To Jātavedas let us pour the Soma' (RV, I, 99 1) addressed to Jatavedas The Jātavedas verse is welfare and wins welfare So he makes this into welfare The hymn, 'To Jātavedas, who deserves our praise' (RV, I, 94) [10] addressed to Jātavedas, is one in which (the verses) end alike This day is one in which (the sacrificers) end alike So the hymn fits this day [11]

[7] It is of multifarious content as indeed is the case and is recognized in the Anukramanı The day is multifarious because of its collection of Vedic mantras and popular elements like dancing

[8] That is only forty one verses are to be taken Cf V, 3 2

[9] The insertion is after the ninth verse, *vilve devah somasya matsan* (Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda* p 137) &c.

[10] On RV, I 94 see Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI 108 sq

[11] At the end Sayana observes that this ends the *karmakanda* of the Āranyaka The next two books are the *jñānakanda* or the Upanisad This regular opposition really of course means very little Both parts deal with *jñana* and not with the performance of the rite, but the first Āranyaka does of course treat the rite in some detail, explaining its mystic significance, while the second Aranyaka diverges to speculations less closely associated with the actual Mantras of the ceremonial A more real opposition of *karma* and *jñana* would be to oppose books V and I-III For the relation of *karma* and *jñana* in Śaṅkara s view, see his commentary on Taittiriya Upanisad, I 12

In some MSS (see Crit Note) a summary of the chapters of each Āranyaka is given at the end For similar summaries, cf those of the Taittiriya Upanisad, Max Muller *S B E*, XV, xxviii, xxix, that in VIII, 3 of the Sāṅkhāyana Aranyaka and Kausitaki Upanisad, IV, 2

# ARANYAKA II

## Adhyāya 1

This is the path, this[1] is the sacrifice, this is *brahman*; this is truth Therefore let no man diverge[2] from it, let no man transgress it For they did not transgress it; of old, those that did transgress it were overcome A Ṛṣi[3]

[1] Sayana, following, as throughout this part of his commentary, Śaṅkara (cf Śankara on Taittirīya Upaniṣad, I, 12, translated by S. Sitarāma, *Upanishads*, V, 112-122), discusses the relation of the *karmakanda* and the Upaniṣad His conclusion is that it is that of *sādhana* and *sadhya* the sacrifices serving to purify the mind through the destruction of evil and the production of a desire for knowledge He quotes and rejects the views (1) that knowledge is unnecessary, it being sufficient to give up all works good or evil, and to perform the various regular and occasional sacrifices, and to exhaust what one has begun by enjoying it, so that at death freedom is attained He points out that it is not possible to abandon good and evil, such acts being endless, and that the sacrifices performed must bear fruits and the actions of previous births must produce many other births (2) Others held that a union of knowledge and sacrifice is the cause of freedom But knowledge is directly contradictory to sacrifice, since the latter involves the conception of the self as active, whereas the former recognizes that the self is *nirvikara* (3) Others hold that sacrifice is the ladder which beginning with the simplest and ending with the most complicated sacrificial rites leads to knowledge as the cause of freedom Sayana points out life is too short for this (4) Others think the *karmakanda* is used in a subsidiary manner, just as in catching cranes one throws curd on their heads and it melting blinds them, so one should sacrifice The reply is that this is surplusage one should catch one's crane straight off The story is reminiscent of putting salt on the tail of a bird (5) The use of sacrifice is to exhaust desire through the enjoyment of the desires produced by such acts but clearly it is replied, desire is not so quenched Sayana also explains at length the *viṣaya, prayojana adhikārin*, *pramanya* and *prameya* of the system which he attributes to the Upaniṣad Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 57 sq, E. T, pp 61 sq 'This' means both what is just past and what is to come, and so Sāyana refers the *etat karma* to Āranyaka I, and *etat brahma* to Aranyaka II and III The latter alone is true

[2] Sayana thus discriminates the divergence is due to mere laziness the transgression to interest in other matters, ploughing or industry, or such forms of devotion as relic worship &c For *pra* + √*mad*, cf Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 5, I, 11 2, Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad, II 6, which support my emendation *pramattam* in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, XII, 29

[3] The verse is of course absurdly construed It is impossible on any theory to make much sense of it As taken in the translation, the idea is that three peoples were ruined the others settled round Agni, in the sense that with Agni as their helper one people has been prosperous, the others not Compare the view of the Śatapatha Brahmana, I, 4, 1, 10-18, that no country is civilized until Agni burns over it, Eggeling, *S B E.*, XII, xli sq., Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 214, 215 The last two verses of the stanza of course are hopeless, save as indicating vaguely the connexion between Agni, the Sun, and Vāyu The Atharvaveda, X, 8, 3, has a different version, see Whitney, *Translation*, p 596

says (RV, VIII, 101, 14), 'Three peoples transgressed Others settled round the sun The great one stands in the middle of the worlds The blowing one enters the dawns' In the verse, 'Three peoples transgressed,' the three peoples which transgressed are the Vayases,[1] the Vaṅgāvagadhas, and the Cerapādas. In the

[1] Sayana and Ānandatīrtha agree in taking this as referring to the fates which in another life befell the three peoples who transgressed The peoples are Brahmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śudras, and only one set was saved The others suffer a *narakajanma* (cf for this idea Hopkins, *J R A S*, 1906, pp. 581 sq), as birds, &c. Only they differ as to the meaning of the words *vayamsi vangavagadhaś cerapādāh* Sayana renders them as birds, trees (*vanagatā vṛkṣaḥ*), plants (*a vanti manusyadīn* and *gṛdhyante 'bhikāṅkṣyante*), and snakes (*urapadāḥ sarpaḥ*) Anandatīrtha prefers Piśacas, Rākṣases (*vanga* is from *vam jīvanam* and *gamayanti*, and *magadha* from *gṛdhu abhikaṅkṣayam*), and Asuras We are justified therefore in holding that there was no trustworthy tradition, and it is therefore possible to consider whether Max Muller's suggestion that the words are perhaps old ethnic names is correct In its favour it may be noted that Sayana and Ānandatīrtha compel us to assume that the Āranyaka accepts the fullest form of the doctrine of transmigration as a punishment (e g Kausitaki Upanisad, I), which is a comparatively late view and which I do not think is found in this Upanisad. If they are ethnic names, then *Vayamsi* gives us a people like the Matsyas, Ajas, &c., in whose names we may, if we like, see totemism[2] The *Vangavagadhah* are a composite tribe or group of tribes like the Kuru Pañcalas, whose name reminds us of the later Vanga (known to Mahabhāṣya (Weber *Ind. Stud*, XIII, 386) and to Mahabharata, Dharmasūtras, &c. in conjunction with Aṅga), as part of what is now Bengal The *Cerapadah* are a third tribe, whose name points to the later Ceras of Southern India. It is of course possible (cf Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p 32) to argue that these verses show a later date and a wider geographical knowledge than is compatible with the early pre Buddhistic date here attributed to the Āraṇyaka. But in this respect it may be observed that Rhys Davids (cf Buhler, *S B E*, II, xxxv sq, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 246–248, Weber, ibid., XXX, 273; *Z D M G*, XLIX, 479) presses unduly the argument from the Buddhist texts. There is in addition to the grave doubts as to the age of the Buddhist texts the possibility that these texts show only the regions where Buddhism had penetrated and that there were Brahminical countries beyond these limits (cf. Buhler, *Ind Ant*, XXIII 245 sq, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 254 sq, *Mantrapatha*, I, p. xv). It may be questioned whether Buddhism early gained a direct hold on much of Southern India, at least there is no evidence that it ever did. Besides the question arises whether the Cerapadas must have been settled in the South at this date. It should be noted that the text says they were destroyed, and this may refer to a disaster to the old tribe, a remnant of which wandered south and later appear as the Ceras, who are known in the south to Aśoka and to Kātyāyana, Weber, l c., p. 371 Bhandarkar, *History of Deccan*, p. 143

The version of Sāvana takes *cerapadaḥ* as *ca irapadaḥ* This seems very unlikely because a single *ca* with the second of three connected words is not elsewhere found in this Āraṇyaka, and is nowhere common (For examples cf RV, I 77, 2 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 101) and Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 475) It is, I think, much more likely that three names of defeated tribes should not appear in the precise forms here found elsewhere than that names of plants and beasts should so disappear At any rate they must all three be plants and

[2] Mere animal names prove little as to totemism, which is not demonstrated for any Aryan stock, cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 116, 256, Macdonell, *Ved Myth.*, p. 153, Hopkins, *P A O S*, 1894 p. cliv, Keith *J R A S*, 1907, pp 929 sq, Buhler, *Ind Stud*, III, 48

verse, 'Others settled round the sun,'[5] these people are settled round Agni here, as the sun In the verse, 'The great one stands in the middle of the worlds,' that great one in the middle of the worlds means this sun In the verse, 'The blowing one enters the dawns,' the meaning is the purifying air enters the quarters[6]

2 People[1] say, 'Hymn, hymn'[2] The hymn is indeed the earth[1] For from it all that exists springs It praises Agni Food are its eighty verses,[3] for by food one obtains all The hymn is the sky For (birds) fly along the sky, and along the sky men drive It praises Vāyu Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all The hymn is also yonder heaven For by

animals or names of tribes Monier Williams' *Dict* takes *vanga* as plants, *avagadha* and *cerapada* as names of peoples, which is quite impossible Dr Scheftelowitz in his forthcoming *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (which he has been so good as to show me in MS) considers that *vanga* is formed from *van* by the suffix *ga* (when *g*=*gu*) He compares *madgu* (not for *mazg but from √*mad*+*gu*), *khadga*, *phalgu* *svargá*, *varga* *phalgá*, *tunga*, *linga* *drbhaga*, *ulig* *vanig*, *sphigi* *ddga* (not=IG *o guo*) &c But even if this is the case the origin of the word throws no light on its being used as a tribal name, nor do I feel sure of the equation *vanga*=tree Possibly *Vanga Magadhah* may be read, cf my *Śankhayana Āranyaka*, p. 46 n 4, Baudhayana Dharma Sūtra, I, 2, 13 and 14

The citation of the Ṛgvedic verse in full is of course natural when an explanation is being given So verses are cited and explained in full at II, 1, 6 (RV, I, 164 31) II, 1, 8 (RV, I, 164 38), II, 5, 1 (RV, IV 27, 1) III, 1, 6 (RV, X 114, 4) III 2, 3 (RV, I, 115 1) In the last case the verse is cited entire to indicate the sense desired to be understood So also verses are cited in full in the Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, 15, 18, 20, VIII 4 6, IX, 1; XII, 8 35

[5] Anandatirtha, here and throughout interprets in a Vaisnava sense *arkam* is Visnu Āditya is Visnu, and *tasthau* is *upasam cakre* To Sayana, *arkam* is Agni *ahavaniya*

[6] Sayana justifies this by *pracyadidisah tattatkarmasu vihitah satyo nusthanavakalyam karanti*

[1] Sayana explains, following the Mimamsa, III, 4, IV 1 III 3, that the purpose of Āranyaka, II 1 3 is to enable men to attain concentration of thought by meditating on things connected with the sacrifice There are five principles in such meditation (1) The meditation falls to the lot not of the *yajamana* but of the *rtvij* (2) The meditation must be on the *pratikas* of the hymns as deities like earth &c, and not vice versa (3) If the *dhyana* is prescribed *for a certain thing only in one Śākha, it can nevertheless be taken over by another* Śākhā e g by the Kausitakins. (4) It is not obligatory in every case to go through all the forms of meditation which are prescribed in connexion with any part of the rite It is sufficient to make the choice desired (5) Nor is it necessary to adopt the meditation along with the sacrifice as an essential part. It is a matter of choice

The last rule shows the manner in which the Brahmins avoided the open rejection of sacrifice and yet justified their own speculations as a practical substitute for sacrifice

[2] That is, not knowing its secret reference Sayana follows the Aranyaka in deriving *uktham* from *ut ti sthati*. Anandatirtha, of course, explains the whole by the doctrine that Visnu is omnipresent and so all things can be identified with him and through him with one another Cf Bṛhadāranyaka Upanisad, V, 13, 1 (where *utthāpayati* is the derivation of *uktha*), Kausitaki Upanisad, III 3

[3] The three sets of eighty tristichs, in *gayatri* *brhati*, and *usnih* V, 2, 3, 4, 5

its gift all that exists springs It praises the sun Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all So much as regards the gods Now as regards the self The hymn is man. He is great and is Prajāpati Let him know that he is the hymn[4] The hymn is his mouth, as in the case of the earth It praises speech Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all The hymn is the nostrils, as in the case of the sky It praises breath Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all The bend of the nose[5] as it were is the place of the brilliant one The hymn is the forehead,[6] as in the case of the heaven It praises the eye Food are its eighty verses, for by food one obtains all The eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and with reference to the self, for by food all these beings breathe[7], by food[8] he conquers this world and by food that world Therefore the eighty verses are food both with reference to the gods and to the self The food and the feeder are the earth, for all that exists springs from it. Whatever goes forth, (heaven) consumes it all[9] Whatever goes thence, the (earth) consumes it all So earth is both food and feeder He[10] becomes feeder and food He is lord of nothing that he eats not, or that eats him not

[4] Sayana points out that this contradicts the Mimāmsa, see Brahma Sutra, IV, 1, 3, 4, but solves the contradiction by saying the first view rests on *nyayabalat*, that here on *va ana balat, kim iva hi vacanam na kuryan nasti vacanasyatibhara iti hi śastrakaranam dindimah Vidy it* here means *dhyāyet* since both knowledge and meditation are concerned with mind (*jñanadhyanayor manasatvasāmyena*)

[5] The reference is to the bend just below the brows where the nose springs out Sayana cites the Jabāla Upanisad II *katamam vasya sthanam bhavatiti | bhruvoh pranasya ca yah sandhih (sambandhah R²) sa esa dyaurlokasya parasya sandhir bhavatiti |* This refers to *brahman*, so Āditya, who is *bradhna*, is here an *upadhi* of *brahman* Anandatirtha takes *iva* as meaning *kimcit* while Sayana says it is equal to *eva* or has no meaning cf I, 1, 2, III 2 6

[6] Viśveśvaratirtha says *lalaṭaśabdena caksur grhyate* The word, found in the Atharvaveda, X 2, 8 properly denotes 'brow' or 'superciliary ridge' see Hoernle *Osteology* pp. 122 sq, 177 sq

[7] The *pluti* with the nasal is *uktarthaprasiddhyartha* says Sayana The neut pred *sam nam* is noteworthy, see Delbruck, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 247, 248

[8] By giving food to retainers and by sacrifice respectively

[9] Sayana and Ānandatirtha take this as referring to the doctrine of transmigration But this is hardly necessary The earth consumes what the heaven sends, e g rain, not persons who are born again, or as Sayana says, sacrificers who having enjoyed heaven after death return again to earth It is not proved that such an idea is known to this Aranyaka. Cf II 1, 1, n 4 3, n 5 3 2 n 3, 7 n 5, 8, n. 15, 4, 2, n 1, 5, nn 6 7, 9. For the use of *preite* (for the form, cf Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI 2, Bartholomae, *Iran. Grundr*, I 54, 70) as *praiti* Sayana has reference to the analogy of *pra* + √*i* The form of the *pluti* is that laid down in Panini VIII, 2, 107, cf. Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 298 sq

[10] This is very obscure There seems little doubt, however, that it is intended as the expression of a vague pantheism Cf Emerson's 'I am the doubter and the doubt And I the hymn the Brahmin sings.' The priest identifies himself with the hymn and also with Prajāpati (see above), and so becomes as Max Muller says subject and object in one

3. Then comes[1] the origin of seed. The seed of Prajāpati are the gods.[2] The seed of the gods is rain. The seed of rain is herbs The seed of herbs is food. The seed of food is seed. The seed of seed is creatures. The seed of creatures is the heart.[3] The seed of the heart is the mind[4] The seed of the mind is speech. The seed of speech is action.[5] The act done is this

Ānandatīrtha interprets it that Viṣṇu consumes all worlds, and all beings enjoy him, which is the same idea attached to the name of Viṣṇu Sāyana contrasts the *upāsaka* and the *anupāsaka* and explains the matter slightly differently in the last sentence as meaning that other men do not enjoy him (*yad vā = yasmāc ca kāraṇat*). He reconciles this with the fact that he is *ādyaḥ* because that refers to *svātmabhūtasarvabhogyajātarūpatvam*. This explanation is not probable, but undoubtedly the construction of the last words contains a serious difficulty as *yad* cannot correspond to *adyuh* The fact perhaps is that *yad* is used for formal correspondence with the previous *yad* though it is not quite parallel in construction It must be taken literally as an accusative of point in which—'or in so much as they do not consume him' For the metaphor cf Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 2: *anadyamāno yad adantam atti*; Taittirīya Upaniṣad, II, 2 · *adyate 'tti ca bhūtani*; III, 7, 9, &c.; Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 6, 2; XII, 9, 1; Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 10, 13; Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa, XI, 3; *A. J. P.*, XX, 446, and the Puruṣa Sūkta. Another possible explanation, however, is suggested by Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, I, 5, 3 · *sa (satyam as devatā) ha tasya neśe yad enam apasedhet*, 'She is not able to drive him away,' where *yad* is a conjunction. So here the exact sense may be, 'He cannot help eating them and their eating him;' *tasya* being used to introduce the dependent clause Cf II, 1, 5, n. 5. No doubt originally *yad* was a relative, but the pronominal quality is clearly minimal in such cases. The opt in such a case is one of consequence or characteristic, cf *brahmaṇaṃ kurvīta yo pātayet*, III, 2, 3, n 3 So I would explain Rāmāyaṇa, III, 19, 7: *na hi paśyāmy aham loke yaḥ kuryān mama vipriyam*, which Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 271) explains (see § 191, 4) as merely indefinite. But the sense is slightly different from a mere indefinite So Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 3, 23 *nā tú tád dvitī́yam asti táto 'nyád víbhaktam yát páśyet*, ibid, 24–30, &c.

[1] Sāyana says this section is intended to explain the greatness of *puruṣa*, mentioned in II, 1, 2 Ānandatīrtha, on II, 1, 2, much more correctly says *vidyāntaratvam na puruṣakhaṇḍenāsya saṃgatiḥ | uttaratrāpy etad anusaṃdheyam* | Cf. Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 88 sq

[2] Sāyana says that the element of *sattva* is represented in the gods, of *rajas* in men, and of *tamas* in animals, &c., and this explains the high position here given to the gods This doctrine is of course later, appearing first most clearly in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 226 sq; E. T, pp. 250 sq, Garbe (*Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī*, p. 592) has conclusively, I think, dispersed the assumption countenanced by Weber (*Ind Stud*, IX, 11), Muir (*Texts*, V, 309), and Whitney (*Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 601) that Atharvaveda, X, 8, 43 refers to the *guṇas*, see Lanman, ibid, p. 1045

[3] Because the *jīvātman* is here, says Sāyana. Cf. Deussen, op. cit., p 259; E. T., p 287.

[4] Ānandatīrtha distinguishes *hṛdaya* and *manas* as being *saṃkalpātmakam antaḥkaraṇam* and *vikalpātmakam* respectively. Sāyana's explanation is much more probable that *manas* denotes the knowing part of the heart, a frequent early use of the word, cf. Deussen, op. cit., pp. 243 sq; E. T., pp. 270 sq.

[5] Sāyana renders speech as the Veda, and action as sacrifice Ānandatīrtha evidently takes it as equal to *adṛṣṭaṃ kriyā vā*. He also (unlike Sāyana) construes *karmakṛtam* as one word, *karmanirmitam*. Rājendralāla prints in the text *karmakṛtam* against the commentary. Sāyana of course explains *kṛtam* as done in a former birth, but this again is an unnecessary intro-

man, the abode of *brahman* He consists of food [6] and because he consists of food, he consists of gold He becomes golden [7] in yonder world, he is seen as golden for all mortals, who knows this

4 *Brahman* [1] entered into that man by the tips of his feet Because *brahman* entered that man by the tips of his feet, so men call them the tips of the feet (*prapadyata prapade*), but in the case of other animals hoofs and claws Then he crept higher up, and they became the thighs Then he said, 'Swallow [2] widely,' and that became the stomach Then he said, 'Make it wide for me,' and that became the chest The Śārkarākṣyas [3] meditate on the stomach as *brahman*, the Ārunis on the heart These two are indeed *brahman* But he crept upwards still, and arrived at the head Because he arrived at the head (*aśrayata*) then it became the head (*siras*) So the head is the head These delights settled in the head, sight, hearing, mind, speech, breath Delights settle on him who

duction of the transmigration theory, see II 1, 1, n. 4, 2, n 9 and Anandatirtha does not accept it The passage only means that action is the man, the man is what he does, a perfectly plausible view For the relation of speech and action see Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 33 4, II, 2, 8 III, 32 9, Mahanarayana Upanisad, IV, 7, Oertel *J A O S*, XVI, 231

[6] Ānandatirtha renders *sa* as *bhagavan* and *iramayah* as *ichanurupasukhapurnah* and *hiranmayah* as *bahyanandavilaksanasukhapurnah* Sayana quotes Taittiriya Upanisad, II, 1, 1 *sa va esa puruso annarasamayah* He explains that as man is composed of food so he is gold in the shape of the egg of Brahman Really the thing is a mere play on words For the form *hiran(ya)mayah*, cf Bloomfield, *P A O S*, April, 1893 p xxxv, *A J P*, XVII, 418, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 279 280, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 58

[7] Anandatirtha explains *Narayanam janan karmajam rupam utsrjya nijanandakarupako bhavati* Sayana says he appears as golden as the sun for the benefit of all creatures Really it means, he appears (*dadrśe* passive cf Delbruck *Altindische Syntax*, pp 264 sq) to all creatures no doubt originally as the sun The passage is like all this part of the Aranyaka II, 1–3, pantheistic. In Śatapatha Brahmana X, 1, 4 9, the Agnicit is promised birth in the other world as *hiranmayah*, rendered by Sayana *hiranyasamanavarnah* see Eggeling *S B E.*, XLIII 295, n 2

[1] Sayana explains that this chapter shows *prana*, the *upadhi* of Brahman, entering the subtle body His entry into the gross body is seen on II, 1, 2 He compares Taittiriya Upanisad, II 6, 1 Maitrayaniya Upanisad II For *prapada* Lanman in Whitney *Translation of Atharvaveda*, II, 33 5 suggests toe as the meaning, but the dual renders that impossible here, and I believe in all the passages cited at p. xcviii the sense 'front part of the foot' as opposed to 'heel' is correct.

[2] Make a large hole, says Sayana Max Muller's 'grasp' is a slip The form is overlooked in the *Dict* and in Whitney's *Roots, &c*

[3] *Śārkarākṣyah* is rendered *suksmadrstayah* by Ānandatirtha, who, however, calls the *Arunayah* Ṛsis. He explains *udaram* as locative in sense as does Sayana, tacitly The Śārkarākṣyas are a subdivision of the Haridravijas according to the Caranavyūha and are mentioned in the Mahabhāṣya, IV, 1, 74 75 Max Muller points out that neither in Chandogya Upanisad, V, 11 15, 17 nor in Śatapatha Brahmana X 6 1, do these views appear—at least in terms *Ārunayah* appears also in Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana II 5 1 wrongly amended by Oertel to *Arunayah*, against the MSS *brahma* may be meant but the neut is more likely Cf Weber, *Ind Stud* XVIII 140, v Schroeder *Ind Lit*, p 91, n 1 That the heart (*hrdaya*) is *brahman* was the view of Vidagdha Śākalya see Yājñavalkya's exposition in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, IV, 1, 7 See also Chāndogya Upanisad, III, 12, 4, VIII 3, 3 *Ind Stud*, II 177

knows thus why the head is the head They strove together,[4] saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us leave this body, then that one of us at whose departure the body falls, will be the hymn' Speech went forth, yet (the body) remained, speechless, eating and drinking Sight went forth, yet (the body) remained, sightless, eating and drinking Hearing went forth, yet (the body) remained, without hearing, eating and drinking Mind went forth, yet (the body) remained, blinking as it were,[5] eating and drinking. Breath went forth, when breath went out, (the body) fell It was decayed. (Because men) said it had decayed, it became the body Therefore is the body the body Who knows this, his enemy, the evil one, who hates him decays, the enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated They strove together, saying, 'I am the hymn, I am the hymn' They said, 'Come, let us again enter this body, then that one of us, on whose entrance the body rises, will be the hymn' Speech entered, (the body) lay still Sight entered, (the body) lay still Hearing entered, (the body) lay still Mind entered, (the body) lay still Breath entered, (the body) arose, and (breath) became the hymn Therefore breath only is the hymn Let men know that breath is the hymn The gods[6] said to breath, 'Thou art the hymn, thou art all this, we are thine, thou art ours' A Rsi says (RV, VIII, 92, 32), 'Thou art ours, we are thine'

[4] There are similar passages in Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, VI, 1, Chāndogya Upanisad, V, 1, Kausitaki Upanisad II 12–14, III, 2, Praśna Upanisad, II, 1 The comparative antiquity of the versions must be open to doubt. But this version certainly seems simpler and more original than those of the Bṛhadaranyaka, Chandogya, or Kauṣitaki Upanisads, which seem to embellish the theme with further details The account in the Praśna Upanisad is simple, but as that Upanisad is on other grounds late, that may be explained as merely a reference to a well known theme, and indicates the danger of arguments from comparative simplicity For *hanta* with subj, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 23 43, Aufrecht *Aitareya Brahmana*, p 430

[5] The masculine, *milita*, is explained by Sayaṇa as referring to *dehah* understood It is probable that the idea in the mind of the writer throughout was *purusa* as the subject, hence the masculines as long as *prana* remains in the *śarira* √*mil* is Brahmana style first Cf Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 4, 11 and 12 (2, 22 and 3 in the Madhyandina text) where *brahma* is followed by *sa* On the other hand in Bṛhadaranyaka, IV, 3 22, the Kanva text, after a series of masculines, produces *anantagatam punyena*, and Śankara explains *rupaparatvan napumsakalingam* The Madhyandina version (as in Weber and Bohtlingk) has the masc., but as Max Muller (*S B E*, XV, 169) points out, Dvivedaganga had *ananvagatam* as he says *ananvagatam iti rupavisayo napumsakanirdeśah* There are also difficulties in the genders in Śvetāśvatara Upanisad, III 17, see Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, 245, n 4 In Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, 22, *kamarupi* and *kamacari*, according to one MS, agree with *brahma* Such uses are not rare in Latin and Greek, e g φίλε τέκνον, *Vergl Syntax*, III 244 For *iti* 3 *mi*, cf Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 22, 2, against Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1890, p 170

[6] The gods are those presiding over the parts of the body, see II, 1, 5, n 3 For Prāna as *brahma*, cf Kausitaki Upanisad, II, 1, 2, Chandogya Upanisad, IV, 10, 5, Taittiriya Upanisad, III, 3, 1, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 33, 2 It was held by Udaṅka Śaulbāyana (Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 1, 3) and is refuted, ibid, V, 13, 1, Oertel, *J A O S*, XVI, 230

5 The gods carried him forward[1]. Being carried forward he was stretched out (Because men say) he has been carried forward, the morning came into being. (Because men say) he has gone to rest, the evening came into being. Day is breathing forth,[2] night is breathing down. Speech is fire,[3] sight yonder sun, mind the moon, hearing the quarters, this is the union[4] of those sent forth These deities are such in the body, but they openly appear among the deities, this is the meaning This indeed said Hiranyadant Vaida who knew this, 'Whatever they give me not,[5] I own not myself I know the union of those sent forth in the body which they enter This it is' To him who

[1] Sayana explains that this section treats of *prāna* under various forms. Ānandatirtha as usual equates *prana* and Visnu The section is composed of bad etymologies The first alludes to *pra* + √*ni* (*pra anayanta*)

[2] For the meanings of *prana* and *apāna* see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp. 249-251, E T, pp 276-279 The oldest view is that they mean expiration and inspiration respectively, whence *apana* comes to refer to the wind of digestion. Cf I, 3, 7, 4, 1, II, 3 3

[3] This idea originates with the Purusa Sukta, RV, X, 90, 13, 14, see Deussen, *Allgemeine Einleitung*, p 157, and later it develops into a regular system of gods who correspond to and guard the several psychic faculties Cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads* p 241, E T, p 267 It is developed most in II, 4 1, 2, where Agni, &c., become speech, &c., and enter man, while here they are merely considered as the several parts of the body Cf. also I, 3, 3, Śankhayana Āranyaka, X and XI, Lanman, *Hindu Pantheism*, p 18.

[4] The idea seems clearly to be that these four are gathered together in the body, and exist openly as deities as Sayana says But *prahitām* is very difficult and the whole seems an explanation of what was even then obscure Cf the varying versions of *purnam apravarti*, *amrtam satyena channam* &c, cited in Deussen op cit p 20 E. T, p. 20, n 3

[5] This authority occurs also in Aitareya Brahmana III, 6 Is his name a reference to gold stopplugs in his teeth? They were known to the XII Tables (B C 450?) and to very early Egypt *Iam* is read by Rajendralala and in the Ānandasrama edition and also by Sayana But it seems obvious that it stands for *yan* written before *m* carelessly as *anusvara*, cf Max Müller, *Marut Hymns*, p. lx II, 3 3 n. 2, III, 1, 4, n 3, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 62, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 313 To Sāyana *yam* presents no difficulty as he merely supplies *padarthasi abhi tam* The word *dadyuh* is difficult because the plural is unexpected after *ise* if that is a third person, when the sense would be 'nobody owns what the deities give not to me' This is rather awkward but not impossible The rendering of II, 1 2 suggested in n 10 there would give in this passage (though *yan* would still remain properly a pronoun), 'He owns nothing that they will not give me also,' which by an easy process of development would slide over into the sense, 'He cannot help them giving me (it),' showing the origin of such a developed construction as that in II, 1, 2 This comes to an assertion of the fact that all that the cosmic *purusa* has (he must be the subject of *ise*), that has man It is simpler to neglect the commentators and take *ise* as first person, thus asserting the intimate union of man and the deities In this use *yat* is used with consecutive force, cf. the Mantra use of *yad* as final with subj. or opt (Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 321, 341), and the classical use (Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 466) The absence of such a use in the Brahmanas (cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 279 e) is improbable *ise* as a third person belongs to a type which occurs in all Brahmanas, and is not a mere imitation of Mantra forms (as held by Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p 429, where see other examples), see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 613 The form *prahitam* presents great

knows this all creatures unconstrained pay homage That is *satya* (truth) For *sat* is breath, *ti* is food, *yam* is yonder sun That is threefold Threefold as it were is the eye, white, dark, and the pupil[7] Even though he speaks falsely,[8] yet speaks he truth who thus knows why truth is *satya*

6 Speech is his rope, names the knots[1] So by his speech as rope, and by names as knots, all this is bound For all this is names, and by his speech he names everything. Men[2] bound with ropes carry him who knows this His hairs are the *usnih*, his skin the *gayatri*, his flesh the *tristubh*, his sinews the *anustubh*, his bones the *jagati*, his marrow the *pankti*, his breath[3] the *brhati* He is covered with the metres Since he is covered with the metres, therefore they call them metres (coverings) Thus the metres cover him from illhap[4] in

difficulty To take it as Vedic for *prahitanam* as Sayana does is to introduce a very rare[*] form (cf Whitney, l c, p 114) into the text on the other hand the word *prahit* has no parallel (save conceivably in form (*Ind Stud.*, III, 225) in *prahitoh samyojane* in the Arseya Brahmana, if we may take that as dual form gen and not as in Monier Williams' *Dict* as a gen of *prahitu*) at any rate in sense Whitney (*Roots &c*, p 205) gives *hit* as a form from √*hi* I think that *prahit* should probably be taken as the 'impeller', i e the deities cause the organs to work, cf. II, 4 1, and 2

[6] *The t of ti is to enable it to be pronounced (Sāyana)* Chandogya Upanisad, VIII, 3, 5 gives a different version, from *sat+ti+yam*, as the binding of the immortal and the mortal (*ti* being the dual of *ti*) Cf Deussen cited in n 4 above Taittiriya Upanisad, II, 6, derives *sat tyam* from *sat* 'manifest', and *tyat* 'not manifest Brhadaranyaka Upanisad V, 5 1, gives *sa*+*t* (so Śankara (as here) but Kanva text, *ti*)+*am* when *sa* and *am* are = true, and *t* (*ti*) = untrue (for *t* occurs in *anrta* and *mrtyu* ) Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 6, gives, *sat* (what is other than the gods and the senses)+*tyam* (the gods and the senses)

[7] Cf Jaiminiya Brahmana, I 254 (*kaninikā*), Śatapatha Brahmana, XII, 8, 2, 26, *A J P*, XVII 400, elsewhere *purusa* is the third member, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 26 1, 34, 1 and Oertel s note

[8] This doctrine undoubtedly shows the moral disadvantages of the doctrine of salvation by knowledge, and it is the precursor of the later immunity from moral censure of the *jivanmukta* Cf Kausitaki Upanisad III 1 Sadananda Vedantasara, 235 *subhasubhayor audasinyam* and Jacob s note in his *Translation*, Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp. 164 167 In *asya* the genitive is presumably possessive cf Delbrück *Altindische Syntax* p 153, Franke *Bz Beitr*, XVI, 112, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* §§ 69 92, n, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 296 b Compare *etam me sutam* with *iti nah śrutih* (Introd, p 57), *J A O S*, XXV, 116 117 For the position cf *Z D M G*, LXII, 129

[1] Sāyana explains the metaphor from a rope for tying up cattle Ānandatirtha explains as usual by identifying all with Visnu [4] His refers to *prana* of course

[2] Like oxen who carry men.

[3] *pranah* here refers to the air in the strict sense, and has not the wider sense of *prana* (Sayana), perhaps it = *ghrana*, as in II, 1, 7, and often, cf my *Śankhayana Āranyaka*, p 21

[4] This must be the sense Sayana however appears to render it whatever evil he desires to do, the metres keep him from contact with it ' The connexion of √*chad* and *chandas* is very doubtful, see I 1, 3 n 6, Leumann, *Et Wort*, p 103

[*] See also RV, IV, 2 3 and 11 *martam*, VI, 47, 16 *manusyais*, Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 319, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 44 Bartholomae, *Studien* I, 48

whatever quarter he desires who knows thus why metres are called metres. A Ṛṣi says (RV, I, 164, 13), 'I saw the guardian,' for he is a guardian, for he guards all this 'Never tiring,' for he never rests 'Coming and going on his ways,'[5] for he comes and goes on his ways 'Illuminating[6] the principal and intermediate,' for he illuminates these quarters only, the principal and intermediate 'He moves up and down in the worlds,' for he moves up and down in the worlds Then there is the verse[7] (RV, I, 55, 8), 'Covered[8] like caves by the makers' For all this is covered by breath This ether is supported by breath as *bṛhatī*, and one should know that, even as this ether is covered by breath as *bṛhatī*, so all things including ants[9] are covered by breath as *bṛhatī*

7. Now come the powers of this person By his speech are created earth and fire On the earth plants grow; fire ripens them 'Take this, take this,' thus saying do these two, earth and fire, serve their parent, speech As far as the earth extends, as far as fire extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of earth and fire decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of speech. By breath[1] the sky and the air are created People follow the sky, and hear along the sky, and the air bears

[5] The veins, says Sayana He explains that *prāna* is the guardian by referring to Kausītaki Upanisad III, 2 *yavad(hy)asmiñ charire prāno vasati tavad ayur* This passage of the Rgveda later served as the authority for the activity of *prana* even in *susupti*, Prāśna Upanisad, IV, 3, Deussen *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p 268, L T p 297 Jaiminīya Upanisad Brāhmana, III, 37, takes the *pranah* and the sun's rays as meant

[6] The four quarters and the four intermediate quarters SE, SW, NE, and NW. For the number of the quarters, at first four, later ten, cf Hopkins, *J A O S*, XVI, 283 *Prāna*, Sayana explains, is internally what Āditya is externally, see Praśna Upanisad, I 5, III, 8 *ādityo ha vai bahyah prana udayati* In the original and in Jaiminīya Upanisad l. c., *vaste* means 'wears'.

[7] Not RV, I, 55 81 (Max Muller following Rājendralāla), nor I, 56, 8 (Ānandā rama series).

[8] Ānandatīrtha and Sāyana both cite and explain quite differently, the whole verse, but they agree in taking the caves as holes for concealing wealth Cf I, 3, 1, n 4

[9] Anandatīrtha renders, 'beginning with ants'

[1] In the nose, i e the power of smell (Sāyana) The use of the masc *sṛṣṭau* with a masc and a neut and of *sṛṣṭāḥ* below do not entirely agree with the rules of concord later accepted Delbrück (*Altindische Syntax*, p 88) gives only one doubtful example (RV, I, 8, 10) and Speyer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 101) thinks that in classical Sanskrit with names of things the neuter is a more common predicate if the genders differ and one is neuter This is laid down in a Vārttika (not in the Kāśika Vṛtti, it appears) on Pānini, I, 2, 72, which runs *tyadāditah śese pumnapumsakato liṅgavacanani | sā ca Devadattaś ca tau | tac ca Devadattaś ca Yajñadattā ca tani | tac ca Devadattaś ca te |* So the neuter appears in Mahābhārata III, 58, 10, VI 6 26, Rāmāyana VI 61, 37 If only persons are concerned the masc. is regular, e g Mahābhārata, XVII, 1, 29 *Pāndavāś ca mahatmāno Draupadī ca yaśasvinī | krtopa arāḥ Kauravya prayayuḥ prāṅmukhās tatah ||* Raghuvamśa III, 23 *tathā nṛpaḥ sā ca sutena Māgadhī nanandatus tatsadṛśena tatsamau*, &c That this is old is indicated by the rule in Homeric Greek, thus formulated by Monro (*Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 157), 'Where an adjective

pure scent[2] Thus do sky and air serve their parent, breath As far as the sky extends, as far as air extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of sky and air decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of breath. By his eye are created the heaven and the sun Heaven gives him rain and proper food, the sun causes his light to shine. Thus do heaven and sun serve their parent, the eye As far as the heaven extends, as far as the sun extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of heaven and sun decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the eye By his ear were created the quarters and the moon From the quarters they come unto him, from the quarters he hears, the moon produces for him the bright and the dark halves for good deeds[3] Thus the quarters and the moon[4] serve their parent, the ear. As

refers to more than one noun, it follows the most prominent or (if this is at all doubtful) the masc is used of *persons* the neut of *things* e g, *Il* ii 136 —

> αἱ δέ που ἡμέτεραι τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
> ἥατ ἐνὶ μεγάροις ποτιδέγμεναι,

because the wives are chiefly thought of, but *Od* xiii, 434 —

> ἀμφὶ δέ μιν ῥάκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα,
> ῥωγαλέα ῥυπόωντα

The neut plur is especially used of sheep and cattle *Il* xi, 244 —

> πρῶθ ἑκατὸν βοῦς δῶκεν, ἔπειτα δὲ χίλι ὑπέστη,
> αἶγας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὄϊς '

The first example shows that a fem can prevail over a neut in the case of persons, the second that in regard to things the neut prevails over the masc, the third that in regard to things the neut. may be used of masc and fem animals Here *antarikṣam* is a deity and so naturally the masc. prevails cf Manu, VIII, 86, where *hṛdayam* is personified In Latin the rule is (Allen and Greenough, *Latin Grammar*, p 173), generally, a predicative adjective will be masculine, if nouns of different genders mean *living beings* neuter, *if things without life* ' as Livy ii, 40 *uxor deinde ac liberi amplexi*, but Livy v, 4 *labor voluptasque societate quadam inter se naturali sunt iuncta* Even if masc nouns and fem occur, the neut. can be used if one of the subjects is a thing, e g, Livy xliv, 24 *natura inimica sunt libera civitas et rex*, or even if two fem nouns represent things, e g Cicero, *de Fin* iii, 11 *stultitia et temeritas et iniustitia sunt fugienda* The basis of discrimination, therefore, is rather between living creatures especially persons, and things (which include sometimes the animals)

The use of the dual and plural of the verb is regular, cf Delbruck, pp 83 sq ; Speyer, l c, though as in Greek and Latin and Anglo Saxon the nearest subject may determine the verb, as is usual in the Bṛhaddevata. Cf ibid, VII, 74 for a set of mixed genders with a neut plur, VIII, 47, for a masc plur with a masc sing, a fem sing, and a masc dual, which follow Cf Delbruck, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 244–247, which this supplements

[2] Sayana refers to Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 3, and Chandogya Upanisad, I, 2, for the reasons, interference by Asuras, for the existence of bad smells, cf Farnell, *Evolution of Religion*, pp. 99 sq Ānandatirtha takes 'him' throughout as meaning Visnu.

[3] Probably it refers to sacrificial acts

[4] Sayana admits the apparent inconsistency of this and II, 4, 1 where the moon is derived from the mind, but explains it away that the creation here is merely an imaginary one for

far as the quarters extend, as far as the moon extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the quarters and the moon decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of the ear By his mind were created the waters and Varuna. The waters yield to him faith for good deeds and Varuna preserves his offspring by his law Thus the waters and Varuna serve their parent, mind As far as the waters extend, as far as Varuna extends, so far extends his world, and as long as the world of the waters and Varuna decays not, so long does his world decay not who knows thus the power of mind

8 Was it water[1]? Was it water? This world was water This was the root, that the shoot This the father, those the sons. Whatever there is of the son's that is the father's, whatever of the father's, that is the sons So it is said Mahidasa Aitareya[2] who knew this said, 'I know myself as reaching to the gods, and the gods as reaching to me'[3] For hence are they gifted, hence are they supported This is the hiding-place[4] eye, ear, mind, speech and breath They call it the hiding place of *brahman* He who knows this throws down the enemy, the evil one, who hates him The enemy, the evil one, who hates him is defeated He is the life, the breath, being,[5] and not being The gods adored him as being, and so became great So in sleep a man breathes *bhur bhuh* The demons adored him as not being, and so were overthrown[6] He becomes great by himself who knows this The enemy, the evil one, who

purposes of worship, a *yath ivacanam* as opposed to a *yathavastu* creation Such inconsistencies are not very important, but this small point adds to the evidence against II, 1–3 and II, 4–6 being by one hand For Varuna, cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* pp 152 sq

[1] Khanda 7 treats of *purusa* as the efficient cause, this Khanda of him as the material cause *Ap* is to be considered as an expression of the five elements according to Sāyana an unnecessary idea The *pluti* indicates a question The cause and effect are naturally identified Ananda tirtha identifies them in Visnu The Garbha Upanisad I, traces the five elements in the human body, but the idea is not necessarily contained here

[2] This mention is enough to prove that Mahidasa did not write the Āranyaka. But it is quite probable that he was the redactor of the Brahmana in its form of forty chapters. The saying here may no doubt be regarded as one of his Upanisads in the sense of secret teachings. Cf Introd, p 16 For the form, cf Leumann *Gurupūjakaumudī*, p. 42

[3] Rājendralala's commentary is wrongly printed *Veds* is an error for *veda* and *omad* is resolved wrongly The end of the sentence explains the dependence of deities on men for devotion

[4] It is called *giri*, because *prana* is swallowed up and hidden by the other senses. Cf the doctrine that the senses enter in sleep into the *prana* The *prāna* forms thus the basis of the senses. Probably the idea of the Āranyaka is something like this and the translation 'mountain' misleading For *stoh* cf Lévi, *La Doctrine du Sacrifice* p 38, n 1

[5] Because the presence of *prana* secures the *jīvatman* (Sāyana)

[6] Sāyana solves the difficulty of the evil effects of *abhuti* by discriminating between the desire of *abhuti* for oneself as shown in the ruin of the demons and for one's foe

hates him, is overcome. He is death and immortality. A Ṛṣi says (RV., I, 164, 38), 'Down and up he goes, grasped[7] by food,' for this up-breathing restrained by down-breathing does not go forth. "The immortal dwells with the mortal," for through him all this dwells together. For these bodies are mortal, the deity immortal. 'These two even go in different directions, they increase the one, but not the other,' for they increase the bodies, but the deity is immortal. He who knows this becomes immortal in yonder world and is seen as immortal by all beings[8].

## Adhyāya 2.

He who shines approached this world[1] in the shape of man. For he is the breath. So he approached it. For he who shines is the breath. For a hundred years he approached it. Therefore a hundred are the years of the life of man.

[7] Ānandatīrtha renders *svadhayā* by Viṣṇu. Sāyana takes it more properly as referring to digestion. The end of the verse means, according to Sāyana, that men nourish the body by food and drink, but not the *prāṇa*. Ānandatīrtha renders, 'at death they see the bodies deserted by Vāyu.' The epithet *śaśvantā* can only be justified by the fact that one of the two is immortal, and on the principle *chatriṇo gachanti*. For more or less analogous cases, cf *māsā, dhanī* (Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 102), and *kṣapāh*, RV., I, 70, 7, as interpreted by Oldenberg, *S. B. E.*, XLVI, 70. On the same *chatrinnyāya* Govinda on Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 8, 10, explains why the Prauga Śastra in the Mahāvrata according to that school is called Vāmadeva's though less than a half of it is by him (Friedlander, p. 33, n. 1), Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, XIII, 113) quotes *dvādaśāu māsau* from Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII, 5, 2, 1; Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XXXIII, 1; Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, IV, 1, 2; *sūmau dvādaśau*, Kāṭhaka, XXXIII, 3, and similar cases from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IV, 5, 7, 2, XI, 6, 3, 5; XIV, 6, 9, 3, XII, 3, 2, 2, Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa, VI, 2, 5 (cf. *Ind. Stud.*, IX, 18). *Viṣūcīnā* is explained as having diverse functions, the breath moving the bodily senses, the body supporting the *prāṇendriyas*. *Viyantā* is referred to the fact that on death the body remains on the ground, while *prāṇa* seeks another world. Cf. Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp. 574 sq.; Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 221; Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber.*, 1893, p. 92; Hillebrandt, *Ved. Myth.*, I, 336, n. 1, II, 8.

[8] Sāyana explains 'immortal' as united with Hiraṇyagarbha; Ānandatīrtha says 'emancipated.' But that this Āraṇyaka knows emancipation, instead of immortality, as the highest end is not even probable. *Dadṛśe* (II, 1, 5) and *mene* (III, 1, 1) are both clearly present passives in sense. The original sense of the perfect was not distinguished from the present in point of time but denotes a state, cf. Giles, *Comp. Phil.*, § 549. Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 31, 32; Delbruck, *Synt. Forsch.*, II, 192 sq.; *Vergl. Syntax*, II, 211 sq.; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 297; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 823. The oldest sense is quite frequent in the Ṛgveda. In cases like *bibhāya* (I, 3, 4) and *dadhāra* (I, 5, 2) the naturally intensive form of the perfect is further strengthened.

[1] This Khaṇḍa shows that the names of the seers of the Ṛgveda can be deduced from *prāṇa's* actions. Ānandatīrtha explains the section as proving that Viṣṇu is superior to all the gods. He takes *abhyārcat* as 'he entered into', *brahman* and the other gods. He justifies his theory by quoting the Vāc Sūkta, RV., X, 125, as proving that Vāc, i.e. *Ramā*, is superior to the gods, and she of course is inferior to Viṣṇu.

The sun and *prāṇa* are as usual identified, the one being the *adhidaivatam*, the other the *adhyātman* representation. The former attracts the vision, the latter impels the body.

Because he approached him for one hundred years, therefore they are the Śatarcins [*] Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Śatarcins He placed himself in the middle of all that is Because he placed himself in the middle of all that is therefore they are the Madhyamas Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Madhyamas As up-breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight Because as up breathing he is the swallower, as down breathing delight, therefore he is Gṛtsamada Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Gṛtsamada All whatsoever was his friend Because all whatsoever was his friend, therefore he is Viśvamitra Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Viśvamitra The gods spake to him, 'Let him be dear to all of us' Because the gods spake to him 'Let him be dear to all of us,' therefore he is Vāmadeva Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vamadeva He protected all this from evil Because he protected all this from evil, therefore they are the Atris Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Atris

2 He also is a bearer of offspring Offspring is *vāja*,[1] and he supports offspring Because he supports offspring, therefore he is Bharadvāja Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Bharadvāja The gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest[2] of us all' Because the gods spake to him, 'Let him be the richest of us all,' therefore he is Vasiṣṭha Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) Vasiṣṭha He went forth[3] to all this whatsoever Because he went forth to all this whatsoever, therefore they are the Pragāthas Therefore they call him who is (*prana*) the Pragāthas He purified all this whatsoever Because he purified all this whatsoever, then they are the Pavamānis[4] Therefore they call him who is (*prāna*) the Pāvamānīs. He said, 'Let me be everything small and great They became the Kṣudrasūktas and Mahāsūktas[5] Therefore

[*] Really, Max Muller points out the name refers to their composing about 100 verses each They are the seers of RV, I The Mādhyamas are the seers of Books II-IX, Gṛtsamada of II, Viśvamitra of III, Vamadeva of IV, the Atris of V For the rest see Khanda 2 The Madhyamas appear in Kausitaki Brāhmana, XII, 3 Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, III 4 2, Śaṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sutra IV, 10, 3, Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116 (Madhyamāḥ), Sarvanukramanī, Introd, II 10 &c For the plur, *Atrayaḥ*, cf Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XLII, 216, n 1

[1] *Vāja* is taken as either the body from the √*vaj* in the sense of going, or as food by Sāyana.

[2] Sāyana translates 'causing to dwell by his entry into us', and Ānandatirtha has 'best of dwellers' The ordinary sense seems preferable Cf II 2, 4 n 5

[3] This seems to be the sense and it is so taken by Sāyana Ānandatirtha takes it either as 'he obtained' or he sang Sāyana says the verses are called *Pragāthās* and also the poets. Probably the poets, of Book VIII, are meant Bharadvāja and Vasiṣṭha correspond to Books VI and VII respectively The same lists appear in Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra III, 4 2, and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra IV, 10 3

[4] Presumably the poets of Book IX are so described Cf. Ārṣeya Brahmana (ed Burnell), p. 42, *Indische Studien* III, 99. In Āśvalāyana *pavamānās* and in Śāṅkhāyana *pavamānās* occur

[5] The poets of Book X are referred to Perhaps also the hymns were called *kṣudrasūktāḥ* as Max Muller suggests, but this is not certain. The last *kṣudrasūktāḥ* no doubt implies

they are the Ksudrasūktas. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) the Kṣudrasūktas. (He said), 'Ye have said what is well said.' These became a hymn[6] Therefore there is a hymn. Therefore men call him who is (*prāṇa*) hymn. He is a verse, for he went to[7] all beings Because he went to all these beings, therefore he is a verse Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a verse. He is also a half-verse, for he went to all these places.[8] Because he went to all these places, therefore he is a half-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a half-verse. He is a quarter-verse,[9] for he has entered all these beings. Because he has entered all these beings, he is a quarter-verse. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a quarter-verse He is a syllable, for he pours forth gifts to all these beings and because none can pour forth[10] gifts beyond him. Because he pours forth gifts for all these beings, and because none can pour forth gifts beyond him, therefore he is a syllable. Therefore they call him who is (*prāṇa*) a syllable. Therefore one should know that all these verses, all these Vedas, all sounds[11] are one word, *prāna*, and that *prāṇa* is all the verses.[12]

*mahāsūktāḥ.* See besides Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana, Bṛhaddevatā, III, 116, Sarvānukramanī, Introd., II, 10, with Macdonell's note

[6] The poet is also called Sukta, says Sāyana, but there is no authority for this.

[7] The construction is obscure, but the rendering 'he went' seems best. The dat is natural, cf. Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 44, Whitney, *J A. O S*, April, 1891, p clxiv, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 286 b Ānandatīrtha renders 'he went' Sayana's version is *svapravešena pujitam akarot*, taking *bhūtebhyah* as *sarvabhūtartham deham*, and Max Muller renders, 'he did honour to' He also adds that the poet is called Rc as well as the Mantra Cf Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 95.

[8] *Ardha* is taken as 'place' (cf *ordo*) by both Ānandatīrtha and Sāyana, and is probably so intended, as Max Muller takes it.

[9] Sāyana renders 'word', but this is less likely. He adds that it means also 'quarter-verse'. For the intrans *pādi*—which (as *apādi*) is recognized by Pānini—cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 266, Whitney, l c., § 845, Speijer, l c, § 170 In Jaiminīya Upanisad Brāhmana, III, 9, 9, *avaci* seems transitive, but see Oertel's note The use of the aor here is hard to distinguish from that of the imperfect, as with *abhiprāgāt* above But in these cases it is possible that the aor has a sense almost present, a natural derivation from the true aorist sense of the immediate past (cf Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp. 66, 67; Giles, *Comp Phil*, § 552 (iii); Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 930, who points out that it is especially frequent in the Maitrāyanī Saṃhitā) It is also possible that the imperfect sense may be old (despite Whitney, § 929 a), for it is found in the Mantra literature In the case of *abhiprāgād* there is the further possibility that after all it means 'he sang of all this' or 'he sang towards all this' (*abhipragayata* occurs in the RV.), and is an imperfect from $\sqrt{}$*gī*, for *gīti* occurs in the Kausītaki Brāhmana and the Mahābhārata (cf. Whitney, § 855, and *St Petersburg Dict*, s. v), or even from $\sqrt{}$*gā*, go. *I do not therefore think these forms are signs of late date*

[10] 'Without him' is Max Muller's rendering That of the text is supported by Ānandatīrtha, the other version by Sāyana. Cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p 441.

[11] Sāyana takes *ghosāh* as the aspirated sonants, *jh, gh, bh, ḍh, dh*, as in Rgveda Prātiśākhya, 714; Siddhāntakaumudī (ed Tārānātha), p. 14; Max Muller, *Rgveda Prātiśākhya*, p. cclxi. It can hardly here, however, have this limited sense. Cf Chāndogya Upanisad, II, 22, 5; all vowels are *ghosavant*.

[12] Oldenberg (*Z. D. M G.*, XLII, 199-247) has shown conclusively that few if any of the

3 Indra[1] sat down beside Viśvāmitra who was about to recite the hymns of this day. He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatīs* Thus he went to Indra's dear home Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home Do thou, seer, repeat a second[2] hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatī* verses Thus he went to Indra's dear home. Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home Do thou, seer, repeat a third hymn.' He saying, 'This is food,' recited the thousand *bṛhatī* verses Thus he went to Indra's dear home Indra said to him, 'Seer, thou hast come to my dear home I give thee a boon' He said, 'Let me know thee' Indra said, 'I am breath, thou, seer, art breath, all creatures are breath, he that shines is breath In this form I pervade all the quarters This my food is my friend, my support[3] This is the food of Viśvāmitra.[4] I am he that shines' Thus said he[5]

4 This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*[1] The consonants[2] are the body,

hymns of the Ṛgveda go back to their nominal composers when these composers are the heads of the great families, but that they were written by members of the family The only possible exceptions are Vasiṣṭha and Viśvamitra under Sudās (p 236) It is possible that here (p 226 n. 1) a recollection of the facts is seen in that book V is ascribed to the Atris, while the others to individuals Gṛtsamada, Viśvamitra, &c., but more probably the plural is used because it gives the proper play of words with *atrayata* This is not, however, a sign of late date, for it seems likely that in RV, X, 181, the author held the same view as he attributes to Vasiṣṭha the *rathantara* (VII, 32, 22, 23) and to Bharadvaja the *bṛhat* (VI, 46, 1, 2), later attributed to Śamyu Barhaspatya (Oldenberg, pp. 225, 227, n 1)

[1] Sayana explains that this Khaṇḍa shows the nature of the *aśītis* as being Indra's food The form *upaniṣatsatsada* is wrong and can easily be corrected, but it is as old as Śaṅkara The Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana, III, 3 7, has *upaniṣasāda*

[2] The collection of verses is regarded as three *aśītis* of tristichs, in *gāyatrī*, *bṛhatī*, and *uṣṇih* respectively For them, see V, 2, 3 5 and notes

[3] Ānandatīrtha explains *dakṣiṇam* as *dakṣabhage sthita īnah patih jayyah tī dakṣina mitraviśeṣanatvād dakṣiṇam iti napuṃsakaprayogah* Sāyana refers the use to *abhivṛddhihetutvāt*, citing Dhātupāṭha, XVI, 7 This sense must be somewhat as in the text.

[4] Ānandatīrtha explains *Vaiśvamitram* as *Ramayābhimanyamānabṛhatīsahasrakhyam annam Viśvamitrena sampāditatvad Vaiśvamitram ity ucyate* Sayana has: *Viśvamitrena śamsanakale sampāditatvad idam Vaiśvamitram*

[5] In Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, I, 6, there occurs a dialogue between Indra and Viśvāmitra It seems to show clear signs of a later origin, though it verbally reproduces some of this dialogue It is much more philosophical. The Jaiminiya version, l c, is very much altered, but all have clearly a common source, and use the narrative perfect (cf Introd, p 67) The threefold boon may be compared with the story of Naciketas (Kāṭhaka Upanisad)

[1] This Khanda gives the correspondence of the various *akṣaras* of the 1000 *bṛhatī* hymn, which is got by the addition of the verses of the whole Niskevalya Śastra, to parts of the body of *prana* (Sāyana) Ānandatīrtha explains it as an identification of the various deities who preside over the sounds, &c. The number 36,000 is merely theoretical, Eggeling (S B E, XLIII, 111) counted about 37,200, and though the number could be reduced in various ways, it is not worth while

[2] What are called by Pānini *hal* (Sayana). The Kaumara school adopt the term *vyañjana*

the vowels[3] the soul, the sibilants[4] the breath Knowing this he became Vasistha[5] Thence took he the name Indra proclaimed this to Viśvāmitra, Indra proclaimed this to Bharadvaja, so Indra is in sacrifices invoked by him as a friend[6] This is produced as a thousand *brhatis* Of this produced as a thousand *brhatis* there are thirty six thousand syllables So many thousands are the days of a hundred years They make up the nights by the consonants, the days by the vowels[7] This is produced as a thousand *brhatis* After this being produced as a thousand *brhatis* he who knows this becomes full of knowledge,[8] of the gods, of *brahman,* of the immortal, and goes to the gods What I am[9] he is, what he is, I am A Rsi says (RV I, 115, 1), 'The sun is the self of all that goes or stands Let one consider this

## Adhyaya 3

He who knows himself as the fivefold hymn[1] from whence all this springs, he is wise Earth, air, ether, water, light, these form the self, the fivefold hymn From him all arises, into him all resolves He who knows this is a refuge

for *kadins* as do the Sarasvata. The term corresponds with the use of the Rgveda Pratiśakhya, see Max Muller s edit., pp xii sq , and with the Śrauta Sutras *St Petersburg Dict* , s v

[3] Sayana takes this as in II, 2 2, n 11, as aspirated sonants This can hardly be accepted *Ātma* is taken by him as *madhyalariram* The vowels must somewhere be alluded to, and *ghosa* can be = *svara*

[4] Ānandatirtha and Sayana both render *śasasah* The Kaumara school also take this term In the Rgveda Pratisakhya it includes *anusvara visarga, jihvamūliya,* and *upadh man ya* , in the other Pratiśakhyas it refers to *śasarahah*

[5] Sayana here ascribes the name to his causing to dwell, and his covering, cf II, 2, 2 n 2 Ānandatīrtha prefers 'best of dwellers

[6] Sayana refers this to the Subrahmanyā rite of the Soma sacrifice, where Indra is called, *Indra a gacha, hariva a gacha* (Sadvimśa Brahmana, I, 1, 12 , Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 12, 3 &c.)

[7] The Kaumara school thus defines *svarah*, Katantra I, 1, *siddho varnasamamnayah* | *tatra caturdaśadau svarah* (Sayana) See Max Muller, op cit , p x

[8] Sayana appears to take the first part of the sentence as independent, and as describing *pranadevah* For *devata apyeti* cf Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 1, 2, Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 24, 5 No doubt the acc is mainly governed by the verb, but the prep force of *api* is too much ignored in Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, §§ 87 88

[9] This no doubt refers to the identity of the sun and the self one of the oldest forms of Brahminical monism. Sayana illustrates the doctrine by a quotation from the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, III, 3 Sun worship is a very early and widespread form of religion, cf Farnell, *Cults of Greek States* IV, 143 , Evans, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1901, pp 108 sq , Manucci, *Storia do Mogor* (trans. by Irvine) III, 3 for its real importance in India

[1] Ānandatīrtha explains that there are three *aksis* and a *pūrvabhāga* and an *uttarabhaga* These correspond to the five forms of Visnu, Nārāyana, Vāsudeva, Samkarsana Pradyumna Aniruddha, who represent earth, ether, air, light, and water respectively

for his friends To him[2] who knows food and feeder a feeder[3] is born, and food is his Food is water and earth, for of them are foods compounded Light and air are the feeder, for by them[4] he eats food Ether is the bowl for in the ether is all poured He who knows this becomes the refuge (bowl) of his friends To him who knows food and feeder a feeder is born, and food is his Plants and trees are food, animals the feeder, for animals eat plants and trees Of animals, those who have teeth above and below and are formed like men,[5] are feeders, the rest food They overcome therefore the other animals, for the feeder is over his food He becomes over his friends who knows this[6]

2 He who knows more and more clearly the self obtains fuller being[1] There are plants and trees and animals, and he knows the self more and more clearly (in them) For in plants and trees sap only is seen, in animals consciousness In animals the self becomes more and more clear, because in them sap also is seen, while thought is not seen in others[2] The self is more and more clear

[2] *Tasmin* may refer to the *uktha* as Sayaṇa and Max Muller take it Or it may be merely a precursor of *asmin*, in accordance with the usual preference of Sanskrit for the order *sa yah*

[3] i e a son able to eat The second *asya* must, I think, refer to the father, not the son The change of reference is too abrupt to be probable and either version is good sense Sayana takes it as referring to the son For the form *a jayate*, cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 27 6

[4] They aid digestion

[5] Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben* pp 74 76) shows the identity of the contrast between *ubhayadant* and other animals, which is found in the Samhitās with the old Latin contrast of *ambidens* (in Festus not = *bidens*) and *ἀμφόδοντ* in Aristotle That however, *ubhayadant* originally included the first class of sacrificial animals with man, as he holds (p 76) appears doubtful In this passage the resemblance to man is made explicit, and this is scarcely so likely if man were naturally one of the *ubhayadant* class Either *anu vidham* or the indeclinable *anuvidham* (as in III 2, 3) is grammatically possible, but the corruption to *anuvidham* would be much easier than to *anu vidham* *Anu vidhah* is also possible *Vidhā* occurs several times *infra* II, 3 4, 5 Cf *vidham anuvidhīyate*, Maitrāyaṇī Samhitā, III, 2, 4 10

[6] In *adhiva caranti* the acc. is governed by *adhi*, a use found in Mantra and Brahmana alike (Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, §§ 87, 88, Atharvaveda XIX, 49, 2 *adhi visvany aruhad gabhira* RV, VIII, 68, 15[b] *adhi tisthan navam ratham*, Vajasaneyi Samhita, VI, 2 *adhi tva sthasyati* &c) I do not, however, think it can well be construed with the gen, so I think the gen *samananam* is a partitive one 'of his friends he, &c.' For similar cases of the partitive gen, cf I, 2, 3 n 6 and Harivamśa, II, 79, 12, where Hopkins *J A O S*, XXII, 152, n 1, takes the gen as local Delbruck (*Altindische Syntax*, p 441) is, I think, wrong in holding that *adhi* rarely has the accusative The root *sthā*, e g, would not naturally take an acc. without the aid of a preposition Cf II, 2, 4 n 8

[1] This is the most philosophical part of the whole Āranyaka and is a determined effort to explain the different stages of conscious life It will be observed that the distinctive marks of man are all elements which make his consciousness into an ordered system and they imply self consciousness, as opposed to the mere consciousness of animals in the form of their receptivity of external stimuli The theory of the soul in Aristotle *De Anima*, II 4 sq, is worth comparing For the form *avistaram* cf I, 4 1, n 11, Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1893 p 11

[2] Max Muller renders, 'but in others thought is not seen,' the apparent meaning being that

in man For he is most endowed with intelligence, he says what he has known, he sees what he has known, he knows to-morrow, he knows the world and what is not the world By the mortal he desires the immortal, being thus endowed As for the others, animals, hunger and thirst comprise their power of knowledge They say not what they have known, they see not what they have known They know not to-morrow, they know not the world and what is not the world They go so far, for their experiences are according to the measure of their intelligence [3]

3 This man is the sea,[1] he is above all the world Whatever he reaches, he desires to be beyond it[2] If he gains the sky world, he desires to be beyond it If he were to gain yonder world, he would desire to be beyond it Fivefold is thus man[3] What is hot in him is fire; the apertures are the ether, blood, mucus, and seed are water, the body is earth, the breath is air. Fivefold is the air,[4] up-breathing, down breathing, back-breathing, out-breathing, on-breathing

some animated beings have not thought What must be meant is that others, i e plants and trees, have no intelligence, and so Sayana and Ānandatirtha construe it *Itara* frequently means, like ἄλλος and *alius*, others, not as opposed to a part of a species, but as another species, *A J P*, VII, 101 Stones have only *sattā*, says Sayana, i e are only objective, not also subjective

[3] Sayana takes the last sentence as meaning they are born according to their knowledge in a *former* birth This, however, assumes the transmigration theory, which is not certainly known in this Aranyaka The better meaning seems to be that taken above, which is more suited in point of fact to the context for the idea of former birth is nowise necessary or in point Sayana cites Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 4 2 and 7, but this Upanisad is earlier The word *yathaprajñam* does not occur in Jacob's *Concordance* Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 2, has *yathavidyam* of transmigration See also Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp 96 sq

[1] The sea is typical of all unsatisfied desires Sayana cites Taittiriya Brahmana, II, 2, 6 *kamam samudram aviveśety aha | samudra iva hi kamah | naiva hi kamasyanto 'sti na samudrasya |* The same idea appears over and again in the Greek Anthology, cf Butcher, *Greek Genius*, pp 266 sq For the separation of the prefix and verb, cf Introd, p 57, and examples from the Aitareya Brahmana in Liebich, *Panini* p 24, and from Bṛhadaranyaka, p 28

[2] *Enam* in R and in Sayana must stand for *m* in place of an assimilated *n*, as in II, 1, 5 n 6 For *ati* √*man*, cf Jaiminiya Brahmana, I, 42 (*J A O S*, XV, 234)

[3] Cf II, 3, 1, n 1 Ānandatirtha here repeats the identifications with the different forms of Visnu

[4] The five *pranas* frequently occur No intelligible explanation of them all is possible *Prana* and *apana*, once originally the same, were first divided as expiration and inspiration, then as breath, and the wind of digestion, cf II, 4, 1 and 2 *Vyana* 'through breathing or circulating air' (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 263, n 1) is the bond between the *prāna* and *apāna*. *Samāna*, which 'distributes the digested pieces through the limbs' (Eggeling, p 264, n 1), leads to union of the two first *Udana* conducts the soul from the body at death. See Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp 249–252, E T, pp 276–280, and I, 3, 7, n 6 Sayana says that *prana* is in the mouth and nose, rising from the heart, *apana* is in the lower parts, *vyana* in all the veins, *udana* in the throat to lead forth the soul, *samāna* leads food and drink evenly through the whole body Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana, II, 5, 6 adds *avana* to the number For further variations see on I, 3, 7, 4, 1 The same five as here occur in Śatapatha Brāhmana X, 1, 4 2-6, and Maitrāyanī Upanisad, II, 6, where see Cowell's

The deities, sight, hearing, mind, and speech, are comprised in up-breathing and down breathing For they depart with the departure of breath He is the succession[4] of speech and thought which is the sacrifice The sacrifice is fivefold, Agnihotra, new and full moon sacrifices, the four monthly sacrifices, the animal sacrifice, and the Soma sacrifice The Soma-sacrifice is the most perfect of the sacrifices, for these five kinds are seen in it, that which precedes the libations,[5] is one, then there are three libations, and the rest (of the sacrifice) is the fifth

4 He[1] who knows one sacrifice above the other, one day above the other, one god above the gods, is clever This great litany is the sacrifice above the other, the day above the other, the god above the others This litany is fivefold As a chorus[2] it is *trivrt*, *pañcadaśa*, *saptadaśa*, *ekavimśa*, and

notes, and Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, 293 With the following, cf. Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad (Kanva), I 4 17, where man, animal, sacrifice, and *sarvam idam* are all fivefold, and Taittiriya Upanisad, I, 7, 1, where mind, speech, breath, sight, and hearing are man

[4] For *uttarottar°*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1, 60 For *api* + $\sqrt{}$*i*, cf Caland *Altind Zauberrit*, p. 18

[5] That is the *dīkṣa* The last is the *avabhṛtha udavasaniya*, &c See Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, pp 97 sq It is worth noting that the Aitareya Brahmana does not deal with the new and full moon or the four monthly sacrifices, though the Kausitaki does, cf Introd, p 32

[1] This section is unusually foolish Ānandatirtha exercises much ingenuity in equating the five forms of Visnu to the several members of each of the sets of five The parts of the *saman* are also dealt with in Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, IV, 9 10 See Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 100

[2] Sayana explains these as follows *trivrt stoma* is formed by the three hymns at the beginning of the Samaveda Uttararcika, 1 9, RV, IX, 11, 1-3, 64 28 30, 66, 10-12 The first three verses are taken from the first verse of each *sūkta* the second from the second verses, and the third from the third It is called *udyati* The *pañcadaśa* is formed out of one hymn, by repeating the first verse three times, the second and third once each, then repeating the second three times, and so on The *saptadaśa* is the *pañcadaśa* save that in the third round the second and third verses each are repeated thrice, i e. (1) aaabc, (2) abbbc, (3) abbbccc The *ekavimśa* is made by singing all verses three times, except the last first and second respectively in the three rounds, i e (1) aaabbbc, (2) abbbccc (or aaabccc—the MSS vary), (3) aaabccc (or abbbccc) The *pañcavimśa* is formed by singing in the first round the first verse thrice, the second four times the third once, in the second round, the first once, the second thrice, the third four times, in the third round, the first five times, the second once, the third three times, according to Dhanamjaya, or the first four times the second twice, the third thrice, according to Gautama. (This seems to be the sense, R s version is corrupt and S is imperfect) These *stomas* are called *pañcapañcini* (not as Max Muller, *vistuti*, which is the generic title of which these are species), *daśasapta*, and *saptasaptini*, no name for the last being given Max Muller quotes Mahidhara on Yajurveda Samhitā X, 9 for the *trivrt* More in point is Sayana on Aitareya Brāhmana, III 42 which closely resembles this passage The *St Petersburg Dict* (s v *trivrt*) gives the *trivrt* as consisting of one *sukta*, RV, IX, 11 only, see Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 308, 309, Pañcavimśa Brāhmana, I, 99 sq, II, 1, 1, 7, 1, 14 1, Hillebrandt l. c, p 101, and schemes in Caland and Henry s *L'Agnistoma*

*pañcavimsa* As a *sāman*[3] it is *gayatra*, *rathantara*, *brhat*, *bhadra*, and *rājana* As to metre it is *gayatri*, *usnih*, *brhati*, *tristubh*, and *dvipadā* The explanation[4] is that it is the head, the right wing, the left wing, the tail, and the body (of the bird) He performs[5] the *prastava* five times, the *udgitha* five times, the *prathāra* five times, the *upadrava* five times, the *nidhana* five times This forms a thousand syllables[6] The verses here are recited as five orders[7] What precedes the eighty tristichs is one order; then come the three sets of eighty tristichs, and the fifth consists of the rest This makes a thousand (verses)[8] That is the whole, these ten by tens are the whole For number is such Ten tens are a hundred, ten hundreds a thousand, and that is the whole These are the three metres, this food indeed is threefold, eating, drinking, and chewing. He obtains this food by these.

5 This is produced as a thousand *brhatis* Some recognize a thousand of various metres, saying, 'Is there another?[1] let us say there is' Some say a thousand *tristubhs*, some a thousand *jagatis*, some a thousand *anustubhs*. A Rsi says (RV, X, 124, 9), 'Sages in their wisdom discovered Indra dancing an *anustubh*'[2] That denotes, they discovered in speech then the breath of Indra He can become famous and of splendid renown 'Rather' he is liable to die untimely,'

[3] The *gayatra saman* is formed from RV, III, 62, 10, *rathantara* from RV, VII, 32, 22, the *brhat* from RV, VI 46, 1, the *bhadra* from RV, X, 157, 1, the *rajana* from RV, VII, 27 1, according to Sayana's note, cf V, 1, 2, n 2

[4] See Āranyaka, I, 4 2

[5] The *saman* of the Niskevalya is the *rajana*, and each of its usual five parts is repeated five times The *upadrava* falls to the Udgatr and all join in the *nidhana* (Sāyana)

[6] The *stobhas* are meaningless syllables, added to verses sung to make up the metre See Chandogya Upanisad, I, 13 These syllables are marked in Samaveda MSS, but they have not as yet been satisfactorily explained Cf Burnell, *Samhitopanisad Brahmana*, p xviii, Hillebrandt, l c., p 104, n 15, Caland and Henry, op cit, App II.

[7] The verses corresponding to the body, head, wings, &c, are the first order, the three *asitis* follow, then come the belly and chest verses.

[8] There are 1000 *stobhas* and also in the whole Śastra a 1000 *brhatis* The rest refers to the nature of number as being measured by tens There are nothing but sets of ten The three 'metres' mean, according to Sayana, the numbers 10, 100, 1000 which govern all numbers This however is inadequate, as the reference is clearly to the three sets of *asitis* The reference to food is because these *asitis* are the food of the bird There is no sign that the numbers 100 or 1000 are to be treated as specially important Sayana's explanation is otherwise good He quotes for *dalatih*, Panini, V, 1, 60 Ānandatirtha is very weak on this point.

[1] Sāyana takes *kim anyat* as the question, *tad* the answer The others do not include the Śaṅkhayanas, who also recognize a thousand *brhatis* This is rather in favour of an early date, the dispute had disappeared before the Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka. *Nanā* may be adverbial, 'variously'

[2] Sayana explains that the clouds rumbling produce a sound with an *anustubh* in it, cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 304, v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp 40, 41

[3] Ānandatirtha takes the whole as one argument and as meaning, 'he can die when he likes.' This is impossible For the construction, cf I, 1, 1, n 4

he[4] declares For the self that is speech is imperfect, since[5] a man understands if driven to thought by breath, not if driven by speech Let him produce the *bṛhatī*,[6] for the *bṛhatī* is the whole self The self is on all sides surrounded by members, and, as the self is on all sides surrounded by members,[7] so is the *bṛhatī* on all sides surrounded by metres The self is the middle of the members, and the *bṛhatī* of metres.[8] He can become famous and of splendid renown, while the other[9] will die untimely, so said he. For the *bṛhatī* is the whole self. Therefore let him produce the *bṛhatī*

6 This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* Of this produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs*, there are eleven hundred and twenty-five *anuṣṭubhs*[1] For by the larger the smaller is comprehended A Ṛṣi says (RV, VIII, 76, 12), 'I a speech of eight feet,' for there are eight feet of four syllables. 'Of nine corners,' for the *bṛhatī*[2]

[4] Ānandatīrtha points out that 'he' is Aitareya Mahidasa or Mahaitareya Sayana vaguely says 'a wise man'. Cf. I, 1, 1, n 5

[5] This is very obscure The version here adopted means that the activity of *manas* if evoked by speech (= *anuṣṭubh*) only is imperfect, but it is more perfect if evoked by breath (= *bṛhatī*) *Manas* will then stand in its wider sense, not as an *indriya*, as later, cf Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p. 245, E. T., p 271 This is very strained, but at least it is less absurd than (1) Sayana's version, 'If he proceeds with the Śastra with reference to the *anuṣṭubh* which is proclaimed as Vac, and not with reference to the *bṛhatī* which is proclaimed as *prana*, then being driven by his mind he does not manage the Śastra by speech alone' He adds that without breath speech merely conceived is inadequate, breath being essential for any sense activity The idea is not unlike the one adopted above (2) Ānandatīrtha renders, 'Being urged to objects of sense by *prana*, i e Vāyu, and by *manas*, i e Śiva, he enjoys them, and not by voice alone' He read *manase* because he tries to account for the *e* Sayana must have read *prane na* and taken *vag* as an accusative or locative, as Max Muller points out. For the dat, which is rarely found in the local sense in the Brāhmaṇa style (Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 144), see Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 43 and cf II, 2, 2, n 7

[6] i e. make out that the *bṛhatī* is the metre

[7] Because it is surrounded in the Śastra (Sāyana)

[8] Because metres are both bigger and smaller than the *bṛhatī*

[9] Sāyana ignores the difficulty of this passage Ānandatīrtha of course renders it, 'he is able to die at will The text follows Max Muller's version The syntax *yad bṛhatī* is very common in the Aitareya Brāhmana, III, 43, &c, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 4 &c; *Altindische Syntax*, p. 564

[1] 1000 x 36 syllables (*bṛhatīs*) = 1125 x 32 syllables (*anuṣṭubhs*).

[2] i e it is nine feet of four syllables and is formed by adding one to the eight feet of the *anuṣṭubh* Sayana says the MS. *navasraktis* is *chāndasah* Cf Benfey, *Samaveda*, Glossary p. 87 The correction *navasraktir*, though easy, is more convincing, because of *r* following Cf. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 31, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 68, n 15 MSS frequently differ in such points, cf Whitney's note on AV, VI, 33, 2 (*ryatki(s)*), cf V, 1, 1, n 18, 2, 1, n. 6 Note should be taken here of the readings of the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 2, 6 *caturtimlati* in the acc., and I, 23, 15 and 23 *pañ aramlaty anuṣṭubhan* combined with Mānava Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 6 *sā ekavimlaty ayam te* (see Knauer, p. xli) I confess that the possible explanation suggested by Dr Knauer of these cases as either contractions with omission of *anusvara* or *visarga* or as neuters is not attractive. In the last case, as perhaps here, the original may have been as Dr Knauer also suggests *cha-smlati(h)* (*ayam te*, &c., with the loss

becomes nine-cornered 'Touching the truth,' for speech[2] united with verse is truth 'I made[3] the body out of Indra,' for from this thousand *brhatis* made into *anustubhs*, which is *prana* connected with Indra, and from the *brhatī* he makes speech, the *anustubh*, as a body. The great litany is the highest development of speech, and it is fivefold, measured, unmeasured, music, true, and untrue. A *rc* verse, a *gāthā*,[4] a *kumbyā*,[5] are measured, a *yajus* verse, an invocation, conversation,[7] are not measured, a *saman* or part of it is music; *om* is true, no is untrue. The flower and fruit of speech is what is true He can become famous and of splendid renown, for he speaks the truth, the flower and fruit of speech The untrue is the root of speech, and, as a tree with roots exposed dries up, and perishes, so a man who speaks untruth exposes his roots, dries up, and perishes Therefore let a man speak not untruth, but guard himself against it. The syllable[8] *om* is empty and goes forward. So if

of *ḥ* (as often in MSS *in pausa*) and subsequent erroneous contraction. So *pañcavimśatı(m)* may have been written by error in the MS and then the *m* dropped and contraction applied But in verse, of course, we find clear cases of contraction or of the use of shortened forms, especially *va* for *eva*, e g Śāṅkhāyana Aranyaka, XII, 29 *puspam eva* must *metrı causa* be *puspeva* or *puspam va*, probably the former, Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, LXI, 830, Roth, ibid, XLVIII, 682

[2] Speech is *anustubh*, verse *brhatı*, and united they touch *prana* Ānandatīrtha explains by equating *brhatı* with a form of Visnu and speech with Umā !

[3] 'He makes' in Max Mullers translation, ignores *aham* Sāyana does not do this, but he explains the sentence by the action of the Hotr, as the Āranyaka uses the third person It only means that the *anustubh* is made out of the *brhatı* which is identified with *prāna*, and *prana* is (see II, 2, 3) Indra.

[4] Sayana defines a *gathā* as *sarvalokaprasıddharthapratıpadıkā*, e g *pratah pratar anrtam te vadanti* (a *yajñagatha* from Aitareya Brahmana, V, 31, 6, the example is not very happy), Ānandatırtha as *parasparam asamam vısamasamkhyaksaram svaranıyamarahıtam khandavakyam* Cf Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp 365 sq *St Petersburg Dict*, II, 731, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p. 429, Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p 196.

[5] Sayana defines as *ācaraśıksarupa*, e g *brahmacary asy apo 'sana karma kuru dıvā ma svapsıh* or *mā susupthāh* (the MSS vary), i e Āśvalayana Grhya Sutra, I, 22, 2, Anandatırtha as *yajñangavakyam* In the parallel passage, Śatapatha Brahmana, XI, 5, 7, 10 (where see Eggeling s trans, *S B E*, XLIV, 101) *kumvyā* is read, which Weber (*Ind Stud*, X, 111, n 1) suggests as equal to 'refrain', cf *kumba kurıra*

[7] Sayana explains *brahmanagata ye 'rthavada yā ca rajasabhadau parıhasa rūpenocyate sā sarva vrthā vak*, Ānandatīrtha simply has *vyarthavak* Cf *Vedische Studien* I, 118, 328 For *nigada* see *St Petersburg Dict*, s v, Brhaddevata, VIII, 104, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 142, n, who describes them as a kind of Yajus to summon the other priests to perform their tasks Sayana gives as an example of a *nigada* *Agne mahāñ asi brāhmana bhārata* (=Taittiriya Samhita, II 5, 9 1, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 26ᵃ) For *saman*, cf. Winternitz, p 146, n 3, who renders it as originally 'Besanftigungslied', 'ein Mittel zur Beschwichtigung von Gottern und Damonen,' Bloomfield, *Religion of Veda*, p 38

[8] A curious piece of common sense (cf Mr Falconers advice to Pepys, *Diary*, Aug 8, 1662) interpolated to avoid the danger of the preceding doctrine that *om* is truth For *om* as *tatha*, see Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 18, and Chāndogya Upanisad, I, 1, 8 The comparison with *amen* is of course accidental, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 162, n 1

a man says *om*, then that[9] is taken from him, if he should say *om* to everything, he would empty himself and be unable to have delights The syllable 'no' is full[10] for one's self If a man should say 'no' to everything, his fame would be evil and he would destroy himself Therefore should one give at the proper time, and at the proper time he should refrain[11] from giving So does he unite the true and the untrue From their union he grows and becomes greater He who knows this speech of which (the great litany) is a modification, he is clever. 'A' is the whole of speech and being manifested[12] through the mutes and sibilants it becomes manifold and various If uttered in a whisper it is breath, if aloud it is body Therefore it is as it were hidden, for what is incorporeal is as it were hidden, and breath is incorporeal But spoken aloud it is body and visible, for body is visible

7 This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* It is glory,[1] it is Indra, it[2] is the lord of creatures 'He who knows it as Indra, as the lord of creatures, leaves this world shaking[3] off all ties,' so said Mahidasa[4] Aitareya. Having departed, having become Indra,[5] he shines in those worlds They say, 'If by this form he gains yonder world, then by what form does he experience this world?'[6]

[9] Sayana construes as 'he is emptied for that, viz. the enjoyment of house, fields, &c' This is to force the meaning of *asmai* overmuch, it is a *dativus incommodi*

[10] Is selfish. Sayana cites Bhagavadgita, II, 34 *sambhavitasya cakirtir maranad atiricyate* |

[11] Rajendralala prints in text and commentary *kalena* It should be *kale na* as the commentary and also Anandatirtha, shows

[12] 'A' with the different letters is the source of the alphabet. It may be interesting to speculate if this denotes that writing where the 'a' was not expressed was already known It may be so, but it is not clear In any case as the date of writing is very doubtful, no great light would be thrown on the date of the Āraṇyaka, cf V 3, 3 ad fin, where the reference is clear but cogent only for Śaunaka's period For later reference to the *akāra* see Jacob, *Concordance*, p 2 and cf Tandya Mahabrahmana, XX 14 2

[1] Sāyana compares Taittiriya Āraṇyaka I 1 *na tasyeśe kaścana tasya nama mahad yaśaḥ* | For Indra, cf II, 4, 3 Taittiriya Upanisad, I, 4, Kausitaki Upanisad, II 6, III, 1 Bṛhad aranyaka Upanisad, III 2 2

[2] This is the sense rather than, 'Indra is the lord' as taken by Max Muller *Etan* below is the usual Sanskrit attraction of a pronoun to the gender of the predicate, *Vergl Syntax*, III, 240 sq

[3] This must be the sense, and so both Sayana and Anandatirtha take it Originally the word meant the decay of old age

[4] The quotation ends here, it seems The new sentence looks like a prose version of a Śloka cf V, 3 2

[5] Sayana quotes Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, IV 1 2 *devo bhutvā devan apyeti* | He refers also to Brahma Sūtra, IV, 3 15, and discusses whether this deification is a hindrance to real *mukti* and decides it is really a step towards it But of course the doctrine of *mukti* is not clearly found in this Aranyaka, see II, 1 2 n 9, Hopkins *Religions of India* pp 232, 238 sq

[6] For the nasal in *pluti*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 299, 300, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 78

The blood in the woman[1] is the form of Agni, therefore one should despise it not The seed in the man is the form of Āditya, therefore one should despise it not This self gives itself to that self, that self gives itself to this self[2] They thus gain each other In this form[3] he gains yonder world, in that form he experiences this world

8 Here there are these verses [1]—

[1] Ānandatīrtha has a wonderful explanation This world and that world are both *svastrirūpam* of Bhagavant Sayana explains that there are six elements in the body, three, fat, bone, and marrow, are white and represent the man, three, skin blood, and flesh, are red and represent the woman *ayaṃ* is used of the woman because she is connected with earth, *asāu* of the man because he is connected with the sun and the upper world

[2] The fact that Sayana does not comment on *imāsmai* shows how little he can be relied on to note points in the text The reading is quite certain, and cf Whitney, l c, § 502 b

[3] This is taken by Sayana and by Max Muller as referring to the words at once preceding But it is perhaps rather a reference to the question above Then *anena* will refer to the knowledge of Indra, and *amuna* to the human form produced by the union of the parents Sayana seems to have been misled by the use of Agni and Āditya into misinterpreting *lokam* The tone of the section is noteworthy when contrasted with the pessimism which the body and its imperfections induces in Buddhism and the later Upanisads (Maitrayani Upanisad, I, 2-4, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 224) Max Muller's view (*S B. E*, XV, l-lii) that, despite its references to Nirvana (p xlvi) and other hints at Buddhism (e g VII, 8), this Upanisad is anti Paninean cannot be supported The irregular Sandhi is merely a conscious and deliberate archaism (so perhaps also in the Manava Gṛhya Sutra, a piece of patchwork), and generally the language is quite recent in form compared to the really old Upanisads Deussen recognizes the later character and style of the Upanisad and Winternitz (p. 225) definitely refers it to a post Buddhistic date Indeed Weber (*Indian Literature* pp 96 sq) and Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 230, 231) tend to refer it to classical times though its doctrine is no doubt earlier The optimism of the Upanisads is natural what is other than the *ātman* is miserable, but not the *ātman*, cf Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, III, 5, Taittiriya Upanisad, II, 9, III, 6, Īśa Upanisad, 7, Hopkins, *Religions of India* p 240

[1] The verses are probably older than the prose They are earlier than the *triṣṭubhs* cited by Patanjali (cf Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 483 sq) and show every sign of antiquity in their metrical form (cf *J R A S*, 1906 pp 1-10, Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX xxxv, Hopkins, *Great Epic of India*, pp 194 sq) which is decidedly irregular The third verses of 1, 2, 4 are *jagatis*, the first verse of 1 has only ten syllables, the last verse of 4 only 9 and even if by resolutions they are altered into 11 syllable verses, then the characteristic *triṣṭubh* ending is missing In no case are the four verses assimilated, and indeed in no case are even two verses assimilated The last stanza, *pada* 1, is in iambic ended *anuṣṭubh*, a very early verse indeed It is of course true, as Bloomfield (*Atharvaveda*, pp 41, 42) points out that the actual development of the *anuṣṭubh* (*padas* 1 and 3) cannot possibly have been from ⏓⏓⏓⏓⏓⏓⏓⏓ to ⏑–⏑–⏑–⏑⏓, and thence to the Epic Śloka with its differentiated *padas*, but that the iambic *anuṣṭubh* is a priestly as opposed to a popular verse with free *padas* 1 and 3 But it is equally clear that the development of the iambic *anuṣṭubh* in the priestly circles was comparatively early and that the later verse writers tended more and more to fall back (with sporadic cases of imitation such as in the Vimada hymns, see my criticisms[a] of Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, in *J R A S*, 1906,

[a] I may note here a small point confirmatory of my criticism of Prof Arnold's views The term *dakṣina* (*pada*) occurs in RV, X, 61, 8 which is therefore naturally called one of the

That fivefold body the undying enters,[1]
That which the harnessed steeds[2] draw to and fro,
In which is yoked the trueness of the true,[3]
In that are all the gods in one combined ‖ 1 ‖

Which from the undying[4] the undying joins,
That which the harnessed steeds draw to and fro,
In which is yoked the trueness of the true,
In that are all the gods in one combined ‖ 2 ‖

pp 484 sq, 720) on the popular *anuṣṭubh* and its later development ⏒⏒⏒⏒⏑––⏒ That development is shown in the late Mantras found in the Gṛhya Sūtras e.g in thirty out of thirty nine cases in the Śāṅkhāyana (Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXVII, 67 sq, *S B E*, XXX, xxxv sq), in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya of Śaunaka (*S B E*, l c), in the Bṛhaddevatā (*J R.A.S.*, l c), in the Epic (Hopkins, l. c., Jacobi, *Ind Stud.*, XVII, 443 sq, *Das Ramâyana* (1893), and in *Gurupujakaumudī* (1896)) It is quite possible and even probable that Oldenberg is right in thinking that the iambic hymns are in the Ṛgveda earlier than the bulk of those hymns where the endings of the first *pāda* of each hemistich is unrestricted in point of form, the period of the Kuru princes Parikṣit and Janamejaya[a] (*Z D M G*, XXXVII, 65)

It is obvious that these verses are of the same type as the *yajñagāthās* of the Aitareya Brāhmana and Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra (I, 3, 10), i.e. they were composed to illustrate and sum up the doctrines which the Āraṇyaka supports, and here as used are older than the work in which they occur (cf Oldenberg *S B E*, XXX, xxxv–xxxvii, *Ind Stud*, XV, 11) These verses form an interesting parallel to the rise of the Ākhyāna, in which the verses perhaps denoted the chief movements in the narrative and were fixed before the prose (or verse later) connecting parts (Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXVII, 54 sq, XXXIX, 52 sq, Winternitz *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 89 sq) For similar verses, see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 6, 23, Taittirīya Upaniṣad II 8 &c In Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad II 4 10, Ślokas are mentioned after Vidyā, Upaniṣads and before Sutras in such a way as to suggest that such Ślokas as here occur are denoted *Asyaḥ* is also a pre Brahmana and Ṛgvedic form, though occasionally found later, e g III 2, 3

[1] This is not very clear Ānandatīrtha explains that the fivefold body is that composed of Narayana, &c, and is male and female united, in which all the gods Narāyana, &c., are united Sayana explains that the breath enters the body and the worshipper meditates on himself as identical with the breath and thus with all the gods. The five are presumably the five senses.

[2] The metaphor is common, cf Kaṭhaka Upaniṣad III, 4 *indriyani hayan ahuḥ* | The senses are meant Cf. Max Müller, *S B E* XV, 12, and n 14

[3] i e *brahman* probably At least so it was later interpreted and the idea may well be early, though it might be enough to take it merely as 'the essence of truth' Cf. Bṛhadaraṇyaka, II, 3 6 *atha namadheyam satyasya satyam iti prānā vai satyam teṣām eṣa satyam* | For the position of *brahman* in the body with *prana* Sayana cites Praśna Upaniṣad, VI, 3 *sa īkṣām cakre kasmin nv aham utkranta utkrante bhaviṣyami kasmin va pratiṣṭhite pratiṣṭhasyamīti sa pranam asṛjata* | For the next line cf Bṛhadaraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I 4 7 *atmety evopāsītātra hy ete sarva ekam bhavanti*, other examples are given in Jacob, *Concordance* pp 260 sq

[4] The undying here is *brahman* the other undying breath as in ver 1 (Sayana)

---

latest hymns by Rhys Davids *Buddhist India* p 30 But Prof Arnold (*Vedic Metre*, p 286) assigns this hymn to the archaic (by which he means the oldest) period !

[a] Cf however Whitney in Colebrooke, *Essays*[2], I, 118 on legendary contemporaneities

Of speech that which is 'yes' and which is 'no',
That which is harsh[6] and that which is immense,
Laying aside[7] have poets found their quest,
They, bound by names,[8] rejoiced in the revealed || 3 ||

In which[9] revealed the poets did rejoice,
In it in unity the gods exist,
Casting aside all evil by this lore,[10]
The wise one rises to the world of heaven || 4 ||

Neither by name of woman[11] is he called,
Nor yet by name of neither man nor woman,
Nor yet by name of man may he be named
By him who fain would tell the name of breath || 5 ||

*Brahman* is called 'a' and the 'I' is there contained[12] This is produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* Of this produced as a thousand *bṛhatīs* there are thirty-six thousand syllables. So many are the thousands of the days of man's life By the syllable of life[13] alone does he obtain the day of life, and by the day of life the syllable of life There is a chariot of the gods which destroys desires[14] Its seat

[6] Sayana cites Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 27 (Ānandaśrama ed, p 333) *khaṭ phaḍ jahi chindhi bhindhi handhi kaṭ iti vācaḥ krūrāni* | *ulbaniṣu* he renders *akroṭ ikam* Cf also Āpastamba Śrauta Sutra, XIV, 14, 1, Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 166, *Ved Myth*, III, 366

[7] *viyuya* like *nama* in ver 4 appears 'metrical'

[8] This merely means they rose above mere names to the unity of *brahman* or *prana* Sayana renders 'dependent on the letter 'a which is the name of *prana*' Anandatirtha refers to the names of Bhagavant

[9] *nama* is rendered by Sayana as equivalent to *namayattah* above. This cannot be the case, nor can it well be for *namani* as Ānandatirtha construes it It must be for *nama* the last *a* being lengthened *metri causa* For such cases cf Macdonell *Vedic Grammar* p. 62, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana* p 427, Sankhayana Śrauta Sutra XVII 9 7, XVIII, 22 10, even in prose (cf Introd, p 70) *J A O S*, XXV, 98, below, III, 1, 2, n 2

[10] By the help of *brahman* is Sayana s version and so also Anandatirtha takes it More probably it is by aid of this doctrine For *apahatya*, cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana, II, 1 10, 2

[11] Sayana quotes Śvetaśvatara Upanisad, V, 10 (the late metre is noteworthy) —

*naiva strī na puman eṣa naiva cāyam napuṃsakaḥ* |
*yad yac charīram ādatte tena tena sa rakṣyate* ||

For the nominative, cf passages like Bṛhaddevatā, V, 39 where I would read *Ilaspatih* with MSS h d, Rgveda Prātiśakhya, XVII, 26, Taittiriya Samhitā V 7, 4, 4, &c.

[12] This must be taken as a clear assertion that *brahman* includes the individual self Sāyana says it refers to Hiranyagarbha quoting the very late Nṛsiṃhottaratāpanīya Upaniṣad, V *sarvakammani Hiranyagarbhah* |

[13] Ānandatirtha explains the *akṣara* as the female form of Viṣṇu, the *ahas* (sic) as the male As a matter of fact the sentence merely asserts he obtains *brahman* or *prana* by means of *brahman* or *prana* as both are revealed in the syllable and the ritual of the Mahavrata day, as in I, 2, 2

[14] Sāyana explains this as a chariot of Hiranyagarbha Anandatīrtha renders *anakāma*

is speech, its two sides the ears, the horses the eyes, the driver the mind Breath mounts upon it. A Ṛṣi says (RV, X, 39, 12), 'Come hither on what is quicker than mind,' and (RV., VIII, 73, 2), 'On what is quicker than the winking of an eye'[11]

## Adhyāya 4.

In the beginning[1] the one self was this, there was nothing else blinking. He[2] thought, 'Shall I create worlds?' He created these worlds, water, lights,

*indrah* as, '*Prāna* has no desires and delights in *Māyā*' i e Ramā. Really all that is meant is that there is a chariot, viz. the body, where *prāna* mounts as contained above in the verses Ānandatīrtha explains the *uddhi* as Ramā in snake form *śrotre* as Candra and his wife, *pakṣau* as Candra and his wife, *cakṣuṣī* as Sūrya and his wife, *manah* as Rudra. The metaphor is not rare, e g n 3, quotation in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra VI, 5, 3, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 8, RV, III, 14, 7, as interpreted by Bergaigne (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 270) where the prayer is a chariot, Atharvaveda VIII, 8, 22, where *uddhi* and *pakṣas* also occur, and are rendered as above by Whitney, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, III, 4, 4, Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, XIII, 8

[11] Sāyana adds a long disquisition (cf Max Muller, *S B E*, I, 235, 236) on the difference of this *prānavidyā* from that of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad and the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, in which *prāna* is not related to the Mahāvrata ceremony Following as usual Śaṅkara he also discusses what is the result of this *prānavidyā*, and concludes that it leads after death and absorption in the *paramātman* to rebirth in the *brahmaloka* where after enjoyment of all the powers of a deity, he proceeds to obtain full knowledge and *mukti* But Śaṅkara ignores the fact that *mukti* is not as yet known to this Āraṇyaka, which in its philosophic doctrine reaches only the unity of existence and the identity of the self and *brahman* and which promises immortality, not liberation, to the devout. It is impossible even to say that this Āraṇyaka, II, 1-3 realizes clearly the doctrine that all is consciousness, though it approaches this standpoint. It does not assert that the self is unknowable as pure subject or the unreality of existence, as is done by the later Upaniṣads and the Vedanta To the writer of this Upaniṣad immortality meant a continuance of conscious existence, because the identity of the self and the world did not involve in any way the destruction of self All that it involved was the destruction of what is really self from its accidents It is of course true that this position is not strictly consistent, but it is no more unsatisfactory than that of Vedantism.

[1] Śaṅkara, Ānandatīrtha, and Sayana all expend great efforts in explaining this short Upaniṣad, II, 4-6, but they mainly deal with difficulties which do not arise if no effort is made to reconcile this text with pure Vedantism or to explain logically its inconsistencies. The real advance on II, 1-3, consists in (1) the fact that *ātman* is the subject, not as before *prāna*, *puruṣa*, (2) that *ātman* and *brahman* are more explicitly recognized as intelligence, but both these points are foreshadowed in II, 1-3 Max Muller (*S B E*, I, 236) leans to the view that this Upaniṣad rises from the conception of life to that of the self, but this is rather too great a distinction This Upaniṣad is a little more advanced than II, 1-3 but not much so Deussen (*Sechzig Upanishads*), of course, interprets it as a later Upaniṣad and reads into it doctrines not contained in it. Colebrooke (*Essays*, I, 47-53), Roer (*Trans*, pp. 26-34), and S Sītarāma (*Upanishads* V, 1-64) follow Śaṅkara On *idam*, cf Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, xix Bohtlingk has rendered the Upaniṣad, *Sächs Ber*, 1890 p 161, cf 1891, p. 85, 1897, p 95 For Rāmānuja's interpretation, cf. *S B E*, XLVIII, 71 81, 201, 206, 391 417 461, &c

[2] This is an imitation of the Puruṣa Sūkta RV, X, 90, cf Taittirīya Āraṇyaka III 12, but, as Deussen points out with the essential difference that the metaphysical *prius* of the *puruṣa* is the *ātman* The view of the relation of the *ātman* to the world is cosmogonic,

mortal, and waters This water is above the[3] heaven, and heaven supports it The lights are the sky The mortal is the earth, those under the earth are the waters He thought, 'There are these worlds Shall I create guardians of the world?' He formed the person,[4] taking him out from the waters[5] He brooded[6] on him, and when he was brooded over, a mouth burst forth as an egg does From the mouth came speech, from speech fire Nostrils burst forth From the nostrils came forth scent,[7] from scent wind Eyes burst forth From the eyes came forth sight, from sight the sun Ears burst forth From the ears came forth hearing, from hearing the quarters[8] Skin burst forth From the skin came forth hairs, from hairs plants and trees The heart burst forth From the heart came forth mind, from mind the moon The navel burst forth From the navel came forth down breathing,[9] from down-breathing death The generative organ burst forth. From the organ came forth seed, from seed water.

not pantheistic. Of course the orthodox view of the commentators that the *atma* is the *īśvara*, not *virāj*, and the creation is *adhyaropa* from II, 4, 1, to II, 4, 3 This is not, it is admitted by Sayana clear from the text, but he appeals to Śvetaśvatara Upanisad, IV, 10, *mayam tu prakrtim vidyad*, and Brahma Sutra, I, 4, 23, *prakrtiś ca pratyñad drstantanu rodhat* besides other passages equally irrelevant. In Jaiminīya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 1, 1, *asksata* the regular form occurs The Aitareya Brahmana often has unaugmented pasts, see p 56, Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber* 1900, p 413 The next clause, here and II, 4 3, may be interrogative or merely an expression of determination (so commentators and translators) For *apas*, cf Atharvaveda VI, 23 2, *Ind Stud*, X, 440, n 1, *J A O S*, XXV, 110

[3] The translation of Max Muller, 'and it is heaven,' can hardly be right, and it is not supported by the commentators It is true that heaven must come in somewhere, for it is sufficient if it comes in as a support, and so Bohtlingk and Deussen, with Colebrooke, Sītarāma, Rajārāma, and Roer take it Ānandatīrtha explains *ambhas* as *mahas* and the other worlds beyond the heaven where the waters were originally placed, 'the blue firmament,' Rajārāma

[4] This is the later *viraj* of the Vedanta Anandatirtha calls it Brahman, in accordance with the Visnu legend Cf Hopkins, *Rel of India*, pp 232 sq

[5] The five elements (Sayana), Brahman, &c. (Anandatirtha)

[6] The sense of √*tap*, to create by will, is pointed out by Śaṅkara, who (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt* I, 87 sq, 91 sq, Oldenberg *Religion des Veda* pp 402 sq) cites Mundaka Upanisad, I, 1, 9 *yasya jñanamayam tapas* I The translation here is borrowed from Max Muller (cf also *S B E*, XV, 28, n 2) For *yathanfam* below, cf Jaiminīya Upanisad Brahmana III, 14, 8, Jaiminīya Brāhmana, II 12 There are sets of three, the organ, the activity and the natural phenomenon corresponding which is later called the presiding deity See e g the Anugītā, Mbh, XIV, 1119 sq For this *srstikrama*, cf Chāndogya Upaniṣad VI, 2 Taittirīya Āranyaka, II, 1

[7] *Prāna* here means clearly the power of smell Originally (1) it meant the breath in the widest sense from which it came to denote (2) life or the principle of conscious life, as frequently in II, 1-3 On the other hand, (3) it was narrowed down to denote one of five *prānas*, II, 3, 3 and these *pranas* were contrasted with *manas* and the *indriyas*, though in death or sleep the fundamental character of the *pranas* came out. (4) The sense 'smell' is an independent and not very common development (5) Another development applies it to all the organs of life, e g eyes, nose, tongue see I, 3, 7, n 6. Cf *Śānkhayana Āranyaka*, p 21, n 1

[8] Anandatīrtha explains them as Indra, Yama, Varuna, and Kubera.

[9] *Apana* here has the other meaning of down breathing, not inspiration, but breathing,

2 These deities[1] being created fell into this great ocean[2] He troubled him with hunger and thirst. The deities spake to him, 'Grant us a place, where we can rest and eat food' He led a cow[3] for them They said, 'This is not enough for us.' He led a horse for them They said, 'This is not enough' He led man[4] to them. They said, 'Well done!'[5] Man is indeed well done He said to them, 'Enter according to your places.'[6] Then fire,[7] having become speech, entered the mouth Air, having become scent, entered the nostrils The sun, having become sight, entered the eyes The quarters, having become hearing, entered the ears The plants and trees, having become hairs, entered the skin The moon, having become mind, entered the heart Death, having become down-breathing, entered the navel The waters, having become seed, entered the generative organ. Hunger and thirst said to him, 'Grant us two a place' He said to them, 'To these deities I assign you, I make you sharers

or wind in the lower part of the body Cf on II, 3, 3 and II, 4, 3 Rajarāma takes it as 'air inhaled by mouth, *not through nostrils* Colebrooke has 'the air drawn in by deglutition', explaining that swallowing was considered a parallel to inhaling Cf. *Z D M G*, LV, 261, LVI, 556, *J A O S* XXII, 249

[1] This section really reverses the former section There *atman* produced the worlds then *purusa* and the deities. The deities now enter into *purusa*. Compare the common process in the Brahmanas where the *brahman* creates the world and then enters it, but here the deities have no creative power and the section only seems to show the reciprocal dependence (cf Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt.*, I, 218, 219) of the deities and the senses of the great cosmic forces and the microcosm I take the subject of action to be the *atman* throughout, so do Śaṅkara and Sāyana. Roer apparently takes *purusa* as subject of all save the first two sentences. Colebrooke apparently read *abhyaichan* and so makes the *atman* alone subject and object in the sentences.

[2] This must mean the ocean of being, from which *purusa* is evolved. Sayana says into the *viraj*, but this seems less probable The *v l*, below *aśanayapipase* is the form in the Brhadaranyaka Upanisad while in Taittirīya Aranyaka IV, 23, *aśanaya ca pipasa ca* is found Cf Aitareya Brahmana, VII 15 *aśanayaparitah*, Aufrecht, p 431, Bohtlingk *Sachs Ber*, 1900 p 418

[3] Because it has no upper teeth says Sayana. He is, however, right in quoting II, 3 2, as showing the real reason for the preference of man, as the most intelligent

[4] The commentators Ānandatīrtha and Sayana who often follows him Colebrooke, followed by Roer Max Muller and Deussen explain this *purusa* as different from though allied to the *purusa* of II, 4 1 This hardly seems likely and the confusion of thought is just as great on the former theory as on the latter The exact parallelism with II, 4 1, of what follows is against their view For the particle *su* cf *P A O S*, Apr 1893 pp xli xlii

[5] Śaṅkara suggests it may mean 'self made' (cf Max Muller's trans. (*S B E* XV, 58) of Taittirīya Upanisad II 7) because man is created by his own illusion, or that he is the 'abode of all good actions', which S Sītarāma in his trans accepts Max Muller (*S B E*, XV, 20, n 4) equates *sva°* and *sukrta* as = deeds performed by oneself and believed to be good

[6] Cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brāhmana I 18, 3, which may be borrowed

[7] This means Sayana says that in the absence of the deity the faculties cannot work He quotes Brahma Sutra, II 4 14 *jyotirady adhiṣṭhanam tadamanat* | Jaiminīya Upanisad Brahmana II 11 12 seems reminiscent of this passage

in them' Therefore to whatever deity an oblation is offered, hunger and thirst are partners in it[8]

3 He thought, 'There are these worlds and the guardians of these worlds Shall I create food for them?' He brooded over the waters[1] From the waters brooded over form[2] was born The form that was born was indeed food The food when created sought to go away[3] He was fain to seize it He sought to grasp it with speech He could not grasp it with speech Had he been able to grasp it with speech, man would have enjoyed food by uttering its name alone He sought to grasp it by scent[4] He could not grasp it by scent Had he been able to grasp it by scent, man would have enjoyed food by scenting it alone He sought to grasp it by the eye He could not grasp it by the eye Had he been able to grasp it by the eye, man would have enjoyed food by seeing it alone He sought to grasp it by the ear He could not grasp it by the ear Had he been able to grasp it by the ear, man would have enjoyed food by hearing it alone He sought to grasp it by the skin He could not grasp it by the skin Had he been able to grasp it by the skin, man would have enjoyed food by touching it only He sought to grasp it by the mind He could not grasp it by the mind. Had he been able to grasp it by the mind, man would have enjoyed food by thinking of it alone He sought to grasp it by the generative organ He could not grasp it by that organ Had he been able to grasp it

[8] Sayana following Anandatirtha, explains that as hunger is mitigated by the knowledge of its (i e food's) proximity, or by hearing of it, so the senses all appease hunger and thirst Śankara's view is that the sensations become eaters by sharing in the deities i e. fire, &c., in the body and in the world, so they share in every offering to a deity (i e the deity and the worshipper both eat)

[1] The five elements (Śankara and Sayana)

[2] Form or organism, as Rajarama translates it, is natural, not something imposed on matter, and it plays no such part in Indian thought as in Greek Even the Buddhist *rupam* is not a pregnant conception

[3] Roer reads *nadat*, 'crying' so Rajarama, and see crit notes. Śankara explains 'that mice &c, try to run away from cats that eat them He takes *ajighamsat* as 'it sought to run away,' and this is followed by Sayana and Ānandatirtha and by Visveśvaratirtha, besides being accepted by Colebrooke Roer, S Sitarama, and Rajarama, Max Muller, and Deussen But that this is correct seems very unlikely Rather it may mean, 'He sought to strike, grasp it' which idea is later developed in detail This leaves the exact sense of *paran* difficult If it is neuter cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1117, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 2, 4, 6, 1, Katha Upanisad, II, 4 1, Maitrayaniya Upanisad, VI, 17, Oertel, *J A O S*, XVI, 226 But if it = to no purpose (cf Aitareya Brahmana, III, 46, 2, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 2, 4) a tolerable sense is made as masculine But I prefer Bohtlingk's *atyajigamsat*, cf Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 106-111 If *enat* is nom, cf Introd, p 56 In Manava Gṛhya Sutra, I, 12 5, occurs *athainau dadhimadhu samaśnutah*, which Knauer (p xliv) defends by quoting the Aitareya Brahmana passage (VII, 22) and Kausitaki Brahmana XXII, 1, and by the fact that *na* in Pali occurs in the nom (cf Muller *Pali Grammar*, p 88) Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1896 p 155, 1900, pp 418, 428, denies the use

[4] As above in II, 4 1 For a rather similar list, cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 60

by that organ, man would have enjoyed food by sending it forth alone He sought to grasp it by down breathing He obtained it.[5] Thus it is Vāyu who lays hold of food, and Vāyu is he who lives by food[6] He thought, 'How can this be without me?[7] He thought, 'By which way[8] shall I enter?' He thought, 'If speech distinguishes if scent smells, if the eye sees, if the ear hears, if the skin feels, if the mind thinks, if down breathing digests, if the organ sends forth, what then am I?' Having split open the top of the skull he entered by that door That door is called *vidṛti*, the place of happiness[9] There are three[10] dwelling places of him, three dreams, this dwelling place, and this, and this. Born he looked through all beings, to see whether any one wished to proclaim

[5] *Vāyu* is derived from *avayat* The use of this causal form is confined to this sense but is found both in Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇa. The sense is perhaps 'consumed' rather than 'seized' Possibly *a vī* is the source (Monier Williams' *Dict*), but this is less likely, cf *J A O S*, XVII, 53, *Ind. Stud* XVIII, 24.

[6] Or he who gives life by food, as Sāyaṇa and Ānandatīrtha take it, quoting Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad II 2 1 *annam dāma*, IV, 3 6, and Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, III 2 Sāyaṇa describes the passage as *tisubrahmane* For the long series of conditionals, cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 950 Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* p 366, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 198 These cases are all normal they refer to a past unreal condition for the act of creation is not conceived as continuous, and correspond to the Latin pluperfect subject or the Greek aorist indic. in protasis with ἄν with aorist in apodosis. The form *agrahaiṣyat* is remarkable cf Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VI 24 *paryagrahaiṣam*, ibid, 35 *pratyagrabhaiṣam*, and see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 904 b 1068 a for other cases of the anomaly' The Suparṇādhyāya also contains the form *agrahaiṣam* Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, xxxii see Mantrapāṭha II, 8, 3 *agrabhaiṣam* cf Bohtlingk, *Z D M G*, LIV, 511, with Bloomfield, ibid, XLVIII 577 *J A O S* XXX 135

[7] Śaṅkara illustrates by the metaphor Unless the lord the city keep, the watchers watch in vain There must be the soul in the body Sāyaṇa compares Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III, 4 1 Contrast with Aristotle, *De Anima*, III, 5 is interesting

[8] I e by the tip of the foot as in II 1 4 or the skull Sāyaṇa connects the former with the *karmendriyas* the latter with the *jñānendriyas* Ānandatīrtha refers to a variant in Śaṅkara's commentary *anavar* for *ataḥ* It obviously must have been wrong but it is worth noting that Śaṅkara's text was not very complete or certain. It is noteworthy that here we have no hint of *karman* (cf. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad III 2, 13 sq, IV, 4 2 5)

[9] So called because connected with Hari, says Ānandatīrtha. The Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa knows a *nāndana sāman* and Sāmaveda, II 651, a *nāndana svarga*

[10] These three are variously interpreted Śaṅkara gives two explanations. The first is that of right eye inner mind and ether in the heart. Ānandatīrtha explains the mind as in the throat, and identifies the heart with the ether He thus gets in his own commentary the triad right eye throat, and heart, and so Colebrooke Sāyaṇa as often follows him rather than Śaṅkara, and after him cites the Brahma Upaniṣad III *netre jāgaritam vidyāt kaṇṭhe svapnam samādiśet | suṣuptam hṛdayasya tu* (al. *hṛdayastham*) | Śaṅkara and the others explain the states as of waking dreaming and deep sleep for all are sleep as compared with true knowledge of *brahman* (cf Kaivalya Upaniṣad, XII) The other explanation is that referring to another birth viz. one's own body and those of one's mother and father, this is no doubt quite wrong but Sāyaṇa reconciles the two theories by assigning two kinds of *saṃsāra*, *dinacarya saṃsāra* and *janmāntarasaṃsāra* to which the theories correspond

another self[11] He saw this person only as the most widely extended *brahman*[12] I have seen it, so he said. Therefore he was Idamdra by name, he was indeed

[11] Śankara does not explain this passage Ānandatīrtha says that either he regarded it as clear or his copyists (cf n 8) omitted it His own explanation gives us a choice (1) He identified himself with creatures because he did not see the true self, *iti* being used in the sense of *yasmat*, or simply, he identified himself with creatures he did not see the true self, *iti* marking the close of the *adhyaropa* section (2) The *adhyaropa* ends with *avasatha iti*, and with *sa jata* begins the *apavada* He examined the creatures separately, whether they had *svattah satta* or not, and concluded that 'there is nothing that I can call different from the true self' *Vadisyami* is given for *vavadisat* Sayana follows this one of Ānandatīrtha's explanations, using some of the actual words Colebrooke has, 'What else (but him) can I here affirm (to exist)?' S Sitārama renders 'How should he speak of any other?' and Roer has, 'How could he desire to declare any other thing different from him?' Rajarama, 'Can any (element) here call (the ruler) different?' Max Muller and Deussen render, 'whether anything wished to proclaim here another self.' This must be right, or perhaps the subject should be 'any person', the difference is, however, slight This version is supported by Ānandatīrtha in his own commentary, *iha bhutesu anyam matto 'nyam pravartakam vavadisat kim vadet*, says Visnu *Vavadisat* cannot refer to the subject of *abhivyaikhyat* and *anyam* must refer to *atmanam* *Vāvadisat* may be an intensive aor subj, or the injunctive of a desid from the intensive, both rare forms (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1019, 1025) Nilakantha thinks this passage is referred to in the Moksadharma Mbh, XII, 10060, no doubt wrongly, see Deussen's trans, p 493 For *abhivyaikhyat*, *abhivyaiksat* should certainly be read The confusion between *khy* and *ks* is very frequent in all sorts of MSS., cf Weber, *Ind Stud*, IV, 273, Hillebrandt's notes on Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, IV, 12, 10, 15, 1, Gobhila Gṛhya Sutra, I, 3 18 (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, 21), Knauer, *Manava Gṛhya Sutra*, p xxxv Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda* pp 174, 175, and at great length in his forthcoming work, *Zur Stammbildung*, &c, on *krcchra*, *Z D M G*, L, 42 Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 136, *Epigr Ind*, IV, 122, *prakhyalitam* for *praksalitam* The Nirukta, III, 20, already recognizes it and uses it in connecting √*khya* with *ṛksa* On the other hand T, a South Indian MS, has the correct °*ksat* though perhaps only by conjecture. Rājarama gives the form as Vedic for *abhivyakhyat*, and no doubt a confused remembrance of such a form may have helped to keep the absurdity in the text when once it had forced its way in *Vavadisat* he gives as *let* of √*vad*. For *atma* he accepts the etymology from √*at*, the 'motor' or 'vital force' Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 116, 117) adopts the etymology of Weber and Garbe (*Die Samkhya Philosophie*, p 293) of *atman* from √*at* and so denoting (1) the wandering wind, (2) the *samsarin* soul, whence come the other meanings, person, self, body, nature It is quite possible that the soul and the wind were deemed to be closely connected—there are plenty of parallels—but of course in this case we cannot take *samsarin* in the technical sense The more usual derivation is from √*an* (Roth), while Deussen (*Allg Gesch der Phil*, I, 1, 285 sq) prefers to derive *atman* from two pronominal stems No explanation as yet offered is satisfactory, since none explains Vedic *tmana*, &c (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 61) Bohtlingk's conj *vaca dišet*, 'to see if it referred to any one save himself,' is good, but not essential

[12] The commentators all read *brahma* separately, and though the sense would be much the same this is better than to take *brahmatatamam* (with S text) as one word The commentators and translators all agree it is for *tatatamam*, and Deussen compares *durnisprapataram* in Chandogya Upanisad, V, 10, 6 We may also compare *navamam* (= *navatamam* according to Max Muller in RV, V, 27, 3, see Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 412) *Varunavayvitamam* for °*vatamam* in V, 3, 2, though there the Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 10, 1, reads *pari*

Idaṃdra by name. Him who is Idaṃdra they call Indra[13] mysteriously. For the gods love mystery[14]

## Adhyāya 5

In man[1] he is from the first as a germ[2] That seed is strength gathered from all the limbs and he thus bears a self in his self When he connects the seed to the woman, then he causes it to be born. That is his first birth. The seed becomes the self of the woman like one of her own limbs Therefore it hurts her not She nourishes the self he has given her there. She, as nourisher, is to be nourished. The woman bears the germ The man before the birth of the child and thereafter[3] supports him. When he supports the child before its birth and

*yatanam*, and for a large number of somewhat similar (but often doubtful) cases Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 280, II, 1, 128, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 58, 59 Bloomfield, *P A O S*, April, 1893, p xxxv, *A J P*, XVII, 416–418 Otherwise it might be translated 'just that' in accordance with Panini, V, 3 93 for which use Bhāgavata Purāṇa, X, 36, 28 is also cited, so Bohtlingk, and in Chandogya, *l c*, °*tana* is now read

[13] For Indra as a designation of *atman* cf II, 3 7, n. 1 For *adarśam*, Lévi p 107

[14] The phrase here occurs in Aitareya Brāhmana, III, 43, 1 *ity ā akṣate parokṣam parokṣakāmā hi devāḥ*, a similar but characteristically slightly different phrase occurs repeatedly in Śatapatha Brahmana VI X, but not in I X, Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 268, X, 127 Cf also Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, IV, 2, 2, where Indra is mysteriously called Indha as the person in the right eye, for the same reason as here Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 161) happily compares the riddles found in the Ṛgveda the Atharvaveda, and the Yajurveda The gods require amusement as well as reverence So also the gods must have animals to play with (Macdonell *Vedic Mythology*, p 148, Oldenberg *Religion des Veda* p 74, and Keith *J R A S*, 1907, p 936) Other examples of obscurity are Śatapatha Brāhmana, VI, 1, 1, 2, VII, 5, 1, 22 (Winternitz p. 177) Cf also Winternitz, *Mantrapatha* I, xxix, n Śaṅkara sums up the result of this chapter in an interesting and polemical discussion of the *ātman* as eternal and unthinkable subject (U pp. 50–64 trans. by S Sitārāma, pp. 39–49), but what he says bears rather on his system than on the Upaniṣad See also Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, p. 38, n 6

[1] Sayana following Śaṅkara thus sums up the result of the Upaniṣad in the introduction to this Adhyāya There is (1) *brahman* undeveloped and truly real, (2) then *adhyāropa* in (a) the fourteen worlds in *brahman's* egg (b) *viraj* who regards the worlds as his body, (c) the *indriyas* arising in his body, (d) the presiding deities (e) the subjects of the *indriyas* including man, (f) the food of the deities and its appropriation, (g) the three states of the self, (3) the *apavāda* beginning with *sa jātaḥ* and ending with the end of II 4 3 This section takes up as regards other births than the present the question of the three states of the soul This section seems to be referred to in the Mokṣadharma, Mbh, XII, 10862, and 9494 Cf. Śatapatha Brāhmana, XI 2, 1, 1, Lévi, p. 107 For the egg, cf Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers* I 93

[2] This simple and early narrative should not, of course, be explained by the *pañcāgnividyā* as Sāyana proposes, but is much earlier in conception Ānandatīrtha explains the whole as a question of the different manifestations of Viṣṇu. The edd except S tārāma and U and Rājārāma punctuate at *retas*, but the comm. and the parallelism *yad etad—tad etad* are in favour of the other punctuation. The sense is the same Bohtlingk's *enam* (= *ātmānam*) is not essential.

[3] The commentators here differ Śaṅkara and Ānandatīrtha in his *ṭīkā* take (1) *janmano 'gre* as 'before birth', (2) *agra eva* as *jātamātram*, (3) *adhi* as 'after birth'. This seems preferable, except that *agra eva* must be considered as explained by *janmano 'gre* Ānandatīrtha in his *bhāṣya* explains (1) as above; (2) as *agryaḥ, sarvaguṇa gryaḥ*, (3) *adhi* as

thereafter, he supports in truth himself, for the continuation of these worlds[4] For thus are these worlds continued This is his second birth This self[5] is appointed for holy deeds The other self having done its duty and attained old age departs, and departing hence is born again. This is his third birth[6] A poet says (RV, IV, 27, 1), 'Within the womb, I learned all the races of these gods A hundred brazen forts restrained me, but like a hawk I escaped swiftly downward'[7] Vāmadeva lying in the womb thus declared this Knowing this, he

*adhikatvena* Sāyana renders (1) *agra eva* as *prasavat prag eva*, (2) *janmano'gre* as *prasavad urdhvam*, (3) *adhi* as *adhikatvena*, apparently borrowing this from Ānandatirtha's *bhasya*. The services before and after birth which Rajarama Ramakṛsna Bhāgavata alone recognizes, as apparently also Colebrooke, are explained as the nourishing the mother and performing the usual ceremonies before and after birth It is just possible, however, that *adhibhavayati* is the verb, and the reference is only to what is done before birth Bohtlingk omits *agra eva*

[4] Contrast the late and elaborate passage in Kausitaki Upanisad, II, 15 The passage, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, III, 11, is fundamentally different

[5] *That is the son The following passage is quoted by* Śaṅkara *on Brhadaranyaka Upanisad,* p 307

[6] Śankara explains that as father and son are one *atman* (cf V, 3, 3), the three births are correct Sāyana says either (1) the *atman* being one, it has three births, two as son, one as father, or (2) the two births of the son have analogies in the case of the father and that of the father in the case of the son, so that each has three births The third birth is taken by the commentators as rebirth in heaven, hell, or in the world of men Probably, as there is no proof that the Upanisad knows the doctrine of transmigration, it refers to being born in the next world, an idea familiar in the Brahmanas (cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp 168 169, *Sanskrit Literature* pp 223, 224) which differs essentially from transmigration, i e birth into this world again, see Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp 294, 295, E T, pp 325 sq, Levi, pp 96 n 1, 97, n 1, Hillebrandt, *Ved Myth*, II, 8, contra Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II, 288, Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber*, 1893, p 92 For *vaya guta*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 190

[7] This verse is very obscure in this connexion Śankara, Anandatirtha, and Sayana all explain it as referring to the innumerable bodies through which Vamadeva had passed until he obtained *mukti* through knowledge This meaning cannot be got from the passage The context seems to show that it only means that Vamadeva knew the three births of *atman*, and so escaped and became immortal The doctrine of *mukti* is not apparently known to the writer of the Upanisad If it were, it would be made clear For the meaning of the verse in the original cf Bergaigne, *Rel Véd*, III, 322 Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI xx n 1, Roth *Z D M G* XXXVI, 353, Hillebrandt, *Ved Myth*, I 282, and especially Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, 1 24, who explains the myth as referring to Agni When the cloud is rent in the storm, the lightning (= *śyena*) breaks from the cloud and simultaneously the Soma flows upon the earth Sayana *in his Rgvedic commentary follows this passage* On RV, IV, 26, 1, Sayana says that Vamadeva, who had in his mother's womb the knowledge of Brahman, sets forth that knowledge of the identity of himself and Brahman, in the verses *aham Manur*, &c (so Śatapatha Brahmana, IV, 4, 2, 21 and 22) So [Sayana] on Atharvaveda, XVIII, 3 15 *sa khalu garbhavastha eva sann utpannatattvajñanah svasya sarvatmyam anusamdadhau* Sieg (*Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, pp 76 sq ) holds, no doubt rightly that the idea is not found in the RV passage, but no conclusion as to the priority of the Śatapatha Brahmana, *l c*, can of course be drawn from the fact that no mention is there made of the legend, which may quite well have been known to the Śatapatha, though not referred to His version

*brahman*,[6] Indra, Prājāpati, all the gods, the five great elements,[7] earth, air, ether, water, lights, all these and those which are mixed with small as it were,[8] seeds of various kinds, born of eggs, born from the womb, born from heat,[9] born from germs,[10] horses, cows, men, elephants, and all that breathes, whether it walks or

*ajñāna, vijñāna, prajñāna, medhā, dṛṣṭi, dhṛti, mati, manīṣā, jūti, smṛti, saṃkalpa, kratu, asu, kāma, vaśa*, ... *ālajñāna, vividhajñāna, prahṛṣṭajñāna, avispṛṣṭajñāna, darśana, dhāraṇa, manu pramaṇeṣu tatatvan matih, brahmalīnam jñānam, sarvapreraṇa, sarveṣu deśakāleṣu svarūpeṣu ca samam ramate, sarvaklpti, sarvakatṛtvam asana amṛtananda svatantratā* Sayana borrows from both, he refers *saṃjñānam* to *samyak*, *medha* to *granthatadarthadhāraṇam*, *jutih* to *javas* or as in Śaṅkara, *saṃkalpaḥ* to *asamīcīne 'pi vastuni samyaktvena kalpanam*, for the rest he follows faithfully Śankara. Rajarama renders 'consciousness, direction, sagacity, intelligence, retentive power, understanding, courage, power of thinking freedom of thought, intrepidity, memory, will, capacity, vitality, ambition, obedience' Bohtlingk makes these subjects and *prajñānetram* predicate

[5] This may fairly be construed as an assertion of the pre-eminence of knowledge The parallel passage in the Kausitaki Upanisad, III, is clearly later for it combines elaborately the doctrine of *prana* (see II, 1-3 above) and that of *prajña* The relations cannot be reversed

[6] Possibly masculine as Śankara Anandatirtha, and Sayana think, followed by Colebrooke, Roer, Sītārama, Rajarama, Max Muller, Bohtlingk, and Deussen But this is not necessary nor likely in view of the neuter below, and Brahman (m ) is not found as a deity in the Aitareya Brahmana (but only as priest, p 68) The occurrence in Maitrayani Samhita II 9, 1, is interpolated v Schroeder, *Ind Lit*, p 91, n 1 Muir *Sansk Texts* V, 323, finds the masc in various Śatapatha passages, unnecessarily But it occurs, e g Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 3 The masc is natural and is helped by the following masc

[7] This passage is relied on by Deussen (op cit p 168, E T, pp 185, 186) in support of his view (accepted by Macdonell, *Sanskrit Literature*, pp 217 sq, n d Winternitz *Gesch der indisch Litt* I, 205) of the lateness of the Aitareya Upanisad But there is nothing in the expression itself to demand a late date, and the fact that the version in the Upanisad of the creation is so detailed instead of being a proof of lateness, may rather be considered a sign of early date, when the creation still was considered a real act and the doctrine of the omnipresence of *brahman* as consciousness was not so fully developed The passages Brhadaranyaka Upanisad I, 4, 7, Chandogya Upanisad, VI 3, 3 both contain a reference to name and form, a conception familiar to Buddhism but not apparently at all early The Taittiriya, II, 6, is evidently a mere *résumé* of a well known doctrine But that Upanisad bears conspicuous traces of lateness indeed it already quotes Ślokas very often and becomes quasi metrical while it knows the Atharvangirases (II, 3) and has a much developed theory of the *kośas* of *atman* For the elements (*ākāśa* = empty space) see Bohtlingk, *Sachs Ber* 1900 pp 149-151 Keith *J R A S*, 1909 July

[8] Mixed with small (Śankara) *Iva* he calls meaningless Cf I, 1, 2 n 3 III 2 6 Mixed from smaller portions (of the former)' is Roer's version, which is no doubt the sense The others of various sorts are opposed to the great elements. Colebrooke has 'joined with minute objects and other seeds'

[9] Śankara explains as *yukadini* which Ānandatirtha accepts. Sayana renders *krimidamśadini* The word does not occur in the Chandogya Upanisad VI, 3 1, but it is impossible to accept that as a valid proof of later date since such lists (cf those of the *pranas*, I, 3 7, 4 1) vary enormously in the same book In *jarujani*, cf *jaru*, Jaiminiya Brahmana II, 430, 6 (*J A O S* XIX 100), Bohtlingk's *jarayu* is not necessary For a similar list of Anugita, Mbh, XIV, 1134

[10] Rendered by Śankara *vrksadini*, by Ānandatirtha *bhuvam bhittva jatani trnadini*, and by Sayana *tarugulmadini* Rajarama has 'shoot born' The form is normal and is not a case

You are the two pins[2] of the Veda May my lore forsake[3] me not. I join day and night with what I have learned I will proclaim the real, I will proclaim the true[4] May this protect me, may this protect the teacher. May it protect me, may it protect the teacher

*vanih* is a conjecture of his the text MSS. in I, 4, 4 have either *vanoṁ* or *vanı*, while, ibid 8, all save one (*vanoṁ*) have *vanı* Only one Paddhati (cf p iv) has *vanim*, obviously an error for *vanoṁ* (which of course (cf V, 1, 6, n 4) is the Sandhi of *vanı oṁ*), if it is not a mere misreading of the MS There is thus no real support for *vanih* (how exactly Dr Knauer would take it, I am not sure), and in the Manava Gṛhya Sutra the simple Sandhi *matma* for *me + atma* is actually found in I, 3, 2 (so also I, 9, 11 *vistarasi*°, I, 11, 16 *visvadı*, &c, see Knauer, p. xxxix) Probably *mani* lead to the more intelligible (to the scribe) *vani*

For *van*, &c, Knauer, who does not notice the Aitareya passage quotes Paraskara Gṛhya Sutra, I, 3, 25, Taittiriya Samhita, V, 5 9, 2, Taittiriya Aranyaka (Andhra text), X, 72, Atharvaveda, XIX, 60, 1 There is also the parallel version in Śankhayana Āranyaka, VII, 1, where *vedasamatsaraniḥ* takes the place of *vedasya*, &c This may perhaps mean 'hidden in', but probably we have a mere corruption, see my translation The Mantras are no doubt old enough Colebrooke, who comments on the use of Mantra as applicable to part of an Upanisad, renders, 'May my speech be founded on understanding, and my mind be attentive to my utterance'

[2] *Ānanayasamarthe*, Sayana Colebrooke renders, 'For my sake (O speech and mind!) approach this *Veda*,' perhaps reading *mānu* Dr Scheftelowitz takes it as 'navel' The word in the Rgveda, I, 35, 6, &c (cf Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 39), seems to refer to the pin of the axle of a cart, and the metaphor is natural enough, cf Leumann, *Et Wort* p 31

[3] *prahasiḥ* may be a second person, or a problematic third person based on a false analogy (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 889, Weber, *Berl Sitz*, 1895, p 830), or an error for *prahasit* Precisely the same difference of reading occurs in Khila, IV, 8, 5, *śrutám me mā prá hāsīḥ*, where Peterson's MS has *hasit* and cf Manava Śrauta Sutra II 1 2, 36 (*hasit*) with Taittiriya Samhita, III, 1 1, 2 (*hasiḥ*), in the same phrase, *dīkse ma ma hasi(ḥ)*, and in Hiranyakesi Gṛhya Sutra, I, 6, 20, 1 *yathasat* for *yathasaḥ* (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, 189) Scheftelowitz renders 'das von mir Gehorte moge man nicht verspotten vermittels des Erlernten,' taking *hasiḥ* from √*has* The long *a* would be unusual,[a] but in any case a derivation from √*ha* seems preferable in point of sense and is supported by Atharvaveda, VI, 41 3, Taittiriya Āranyaka, IV, 42 (Anandāśrama ed, pp 352, 355) The translation will be literally 'O lore, forsake me not,' reading *śruta* perhaps as the nom is unusual, and the neuter voc is perfectly well supported (cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* § 66), and the reading *śruta me* is easily corrupted into *śrutam me*, cf Lanman's note on Whitney, *Atharva Veda*, XVIII, 2 3, Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct, 1887, p xxv, and my note in *J R A S*, 1907, p 225, although the nominative can stand cf Winternitz, *Mantrapatha*, I, p xviii[b] For the sense cf Atharvaveda, I, 1, 4, Taittiriya Upanisad I, 4, 1

[4] From here to the end this is identical with the Taittiriya Upanisad, Śiksavalli, I, 1, or Taittiriya Aranyaka, VII, 1, 1 The sense of *ahoratran* is no doubt, 'I work all day and night,' as Sayaṇa takes it Colebrooke renders, 'Day and night may I behold this, which I have studied' In III, 1, 2, the neut is used

---

[a] Compare, however, *sakṣye* which Whitney, no doubt rightly, reads in Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5 although the form elsewhere is always *sakṣye*, and III, 1, 6, n 5 *Ahasit*, given as only grammatical by Whitney (*Roots*, &c, p. 203), is found in the Daśakumaracarita (Buhler, *Ind Ant*, XVIII, 147)

[b] See also my note in *J R. A S*, 1908, pp 1124 sq

## ĀRANYAKA III

### Adhyaya 1

Next comes the Upaniṣad of the Samhitā text. The former half[1] is the earth, the latter half the heaven, their union the air, says Māndūkeya. The union is the ether,[2] so proclaimed Maksavya. 'For it is not considered independent,[3] and so I do not agree with his (Mānduka's) son,' he said 'They are alike[4] and it is considered independent,' said Āgastya, for the air and the ether are both alike. So far as regards the deities Now as regards the self 'The former half is speech, the latter half the mind, their union is the breath,' so said Śuravira Māndūkeya Then said his eldest son 'The former half is mind, the latter half is speech For by mind one first resolves and then utters speech Therefore is mind the first half, speech the second half, and truth their union' It is indeed alike[5] with both father and son This compact of mind, speech, breath, is like a chariot[6] with three horses He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame,

[1] e g in *Agnim īḷe* m is *purvarūpam* ī *uttararupam*, and *mī* Samhitā (Sāyana) For all this Aranyaka cf. Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka, VII, VIII, printed in Appendix, and my translation, pp 41 56

[2] *Ākāśa* is rendered 'void' by Bohtlingk in his translations of Chandogya and Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisads see II 6, n 7 contra Whitney *P A* , Oct 1890, p liii

[3] This is not at all easy *Mene* (like *dadṛśe*, II 1, 3, 8) seems to be passive because it is difficult to make out a translation either as *niścitavan* (Sāyana) or *manye* (Anandatirtha) The subject must be *vayuh*, and the sense must be as in Sayana (cf Śaṅkara on Taittirīya Upanisad III 10, 4, Max Muller, *S B E* XV 68 n. 1) that *vayu* is included in *ākāśa* and therefore is inferior to it Anandatirtha takes *putrena* as referring to the fact that *akaśa* is the father of *vayu* The subsequent identification he explains on the ground that *vayu* is the stronger In Taittiriya Upanisad I 3 2 the earth, sky, ether (=*antarikṣa*, Śaṅkara) and *vayu* are given as the four factors. *Asya* is obscure it may be a gen = dat and refer to Māṇḍūkeya or possibly a vague reference (cf Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya I, 2) to the subject, helped by such genitives as that in V, 1, 1

[4] *Samane* is neut., probably because *mate* is understood, or perhaps it is fem The solution is that the two views are equally correct, because in *upasanās* it is not things but words that are considered (Sayana) Anandatirtha rightly takes the last words as giving the opinion of Mahaitareya Otherwise they must be Agastya's in which he concurs Max Muller reads as S *cet* but it is not in B or the other MSS and it is merely a misunderstanding of the commentator

[5] They give a similar result, and so are alike and equally justifiable, *na hy upāsanā tattvatattvam apekṣate* For *manas* and *vac*, see Lévi *La Doctrine du Sacrifice*, pp. 30, 31

[6] Visnu is made the subject by Anandatīrtha. The real subject is clearly the meditation on the Samhitā For three horses, cf RV I 39 6 100, 17, VI, 47 24, VIII 7, 28 The metaphor recurs constantly in different forms in Sanskrit Literature e g Mbh, XIV, 1427 sq The analogy with the *Phaedrus*, 246, is obvious. For *samhatah* cf. RV, III, 1, 7, Geldner, *Vedische Studien* I 164

[7] Anandatirtha renders the children as *prajñana*, and the cattle as Vedas. Sāyana with

glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days. So teach the Māṇḍūkeyas.[a]

2 Then comes (the teaching) of Śākalya[1] The first half is the earth, the second half the sky, their union is rain, Parjanya is the uniter Thus it is when he rains strongly and continuously for day and night, then people say, 'Earth and heaven have united' So far as regards the deities. Now as regards the self.

Śaṅkara regards this Upaniṣad as intended for persons who are neither fit for *mukti* (II, 4–6) nor even for union with Hiraṇyagarbha (II, 1–3)

[a] This section gives us the views of certain Māṇḍūkeyas The Māṇḍukeyas occur in Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, § 200, and in the Purāṇa tradition (Weber, *Ind Stud*, II, 100 sq, III, 253) Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, p 12, has revived the theory that certain of the Khilas represent parts of their Saṃhitā, but cf. Oldenberg's review, *Gott gel Anz*, 1907, pp 218 sq, and my review, *J R A S*, 1907, pp 226 sq The word Upaniṣad in this section clearly means 'secret doctrine'. This is certainly the earliest sense of the word (derived, no doubt, from teaching in the forest, which was done for the sake of secrecy, cf Introd, p 15) I cannot accept Deussen's view (*Philosophie der Upanishads* pp 13 sq) that the earliest sense was 'secret word' (a case like *tajjalan*, &c.), then 'secret text', then 'secret sense' of a ritual action The earliest sense may well have been 'secret meaning' of a *ritual action* whence *it seems to me the other meanings* are very easily derived Deussen's theory is bound up with his view of the Kṣatriyas as propounders of a secret lore, as to which cf Introd., pp 50 sq, III, 2, 6, n 11 I agree with Deussen, however, and with Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 209, n.) in rejecting Oldenberg's view (*Z D M G*, L, 458 sq) of Upaniṣad as *upāsana* See, however, also *Z D M G*, LIV, 70 sq, and Max Müller's view in 1869 *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya*, p iv, Hopkins, *Act of Ind a* p. 218

A muddled version of this section occurs in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, I, 2, 3 *Māṇḍukeyaḥ saṃhitāṃ vāyum āha tathākāśaṃ cāsya Mākṣavya eva | samānatām antie cambare ca mātṛāgastya vyapārtharaṃ tad eva || 2 || adhyātmakḷptau Śūravīraḥ sutaḥ*[a] *ca vāṃmanaser vivadanty ānupūrvye | sandher vivartanam nirbhujam vadanti śuddhākṣaroccāraṇam ca pratṛṇṇam* || 3 || See Max Müller, pp iii–vi The Śāṅkhāyana has, VII, 2, an attempt at an improved version, reading in one MS *parārthyaḥ* in both cases. Böhtlingk, in the smaller *Dict*, I, 130 renders *avyapārthyā* as 'identic' but this makes no sense The reference in the Prātiśākhya is of course valuable as giving Śaunaka's date as a *terminus ad quem* for the lowest date of the Āraṇyaka.

[1] It refers to the case of *iko yaṇ aci* Pāṇini VI, 6 77, i e where vowels like *i* become *y* before *a* A fourth party is introduced. Śākalya must of course be the great grammarian to whom the Saṃhitā is ascribed, and this gives us not a very ancient date for this Upaniṣad But it need not have been written long after Śākalya. Rather it seems to be early For Śākalya's date see Introd., p. 71 He most probably go back to 700 B C Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 144 sq) considers that Śākalya must be identical with Vidagdha Śākalya mentioned in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XI 6, 3, XIV, 6 9 (see Weber, *Ind Stud* IX, 277 sq, *Indian Literature*, p 33) and identified with the maker of the *padapāṭha* by the Vāyu Purāṇa, LX 58 He was therefore a contemporary of Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya in opposition to Oldenberg's view (*Prolegomena*, pp 371 sq) which refers him to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period.[b] Weber (l c) thinks that *Sākala in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, III 43 5, refers to his school, but the*

[a] *sutaḥ* which is wrong in fact, illustrates the inaccuracy of the reproduction

[b] Geldner evidently takes a much more respectful view of the antiquity of these sages than I would. I think it quite possible to hold that Śākalya and they belong alike to the end of the Brāhmaṇa period On the other hand I think Hoernle's dating (*Osteology*, pp 106 sq) wrong, see *Z D M G*, 1908 pp 138, 139 *J R A S*, 1908 p 364

Every man is egg-like,[1] there are two halves, they say;[2] this is the earth, this is the heaven, and between them is the ether, just as there is the ether between earth and heaven. In this ether[4] the breath is fixed, as is the air in that ether.

reference is too far fetched to be worth consideration—indeed such comparisons hinder rather than aid progress. The evidence of the Vayu Purana is worthless. Identifications are easy and obvious, and we cannot tell that we have a piece of tradition at all. The fact that the Aitareya Brāhmana does follow the rule of Śakalya (Panini VI, 1, 128), that *a* before *r* becomes *a* and that *a* may remain, cannot prove that Śakalya is prior to it: the reverse may be the case. As Geldner admits, the RV.—and the Aitareya Brahmana is in the same position—do not follow his rule (VI, 1, 127) as to *ĭ ŭ* before dissimilar vowels, and we are left with grave doubts whether Geldner's view that Śakalya was merely to Panini the author of the *padapatha* and author of the Pratiśakhya is sound. The fact therefore remains that when Aitareya Brahmana, III, 46, recognizes *bhavati utibhih* as the pronunciation, it cannot have before it Śakalya's text, unless we admit (which is too bold) that the Samhita is later than Śakalya. I prefer therefore, Oldenberg's date of Śakalya, and I would lay stress on the fact that in the Aranyaka he is Sthavira Śakalya[a] in the Brahmana Vidagdha. These names are too distinct to permit of identification. The Śakalya of the Pratiśakhya is likewise Sthavira and must be the same as the man here[b]

[1] *Andam* (later *anda*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 171, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 33, n 14) *andasadrśam varnaviśeshavat chandasah* (Sayana). The neut is noteworthy as comparatively rare in Sanskrit. Cf Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 13 *krpanam ha duhita*, also II 3, 5, *madhyam atma* &c. Parallels are common in Greek and Latin (οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p 166, *malum mihi videtur (esse) mors* Cicero, *Tusc* I 5 9). The use is thus substantival rather than adjectival as is clearly felt in the case of *madhyam*. See also the striking case, Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 4 3 *tasmad idam ardhabrgalam iva svah* (so Bohtlingk, *Chrestomathie*[2], p 357, Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 85, n 3). In *iti nu* there is a lengthening found also in the Aitareya Brahmana in prose (Aufrecht, p 427) with *iti* also. Cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 312, II, 3, 8, n 9

[2] 'They say' can hardly refer to the following words, as Max Muller takes it, though this is partly supported by the last words of the section

[4] *Tasmin hasmin* is certainly curious. The Śankhayana parallel VII, 3, is a correction and throws no light. The MS evidence is strong and Ānandatirtha renders it as *tasmin ha asmin*. Perhaps *smin* stands for *asmin* (cf Muller *Pali Grammar*, p 24) and *ha* is the particle. No root or base *ha* exists from which *hasmin* could naturally be formed. Sayana ignores the point and may possibly have read *tasminn asmin* as does Rajendralala, but this is unlikely. The correction *hasmin* leaves the error unexplained. It is to be noted that in the Śunahśepa legend, Aitareya Brahmana VII, 13 the MSS read *iti ha sma akhyayya* which Aufrecht keeps in the text and gives (p 431) as one of the grammatical errors of the Brahmana. The parallel Śankhāyana text has merely *iti*. Bohtlingk in his *Chrestomathie*[3], p. 351 and *Sachs Ber* 1900, p 418, amends to *hasma* and claims that Sāyana bears this out. But Sāyana's note while showing that he took *smā* as equivalent to *asmat* is not conclusive though it tends to show that he had *asma(t)* before him, just as he seems to have read *tasminn asmin* here but arguments from his silence are dangerous. He ignores *imasmai* in II, 3 7. I do not think it impossible that this *smin* and the Aitareya Brahmana's *sma* are parallel phenomena of an attempted simplification of

[a] It is true Sthavira does not occur in III 1 2, but I do not think it is reasonable to take the Śakalya of that passage as different from him of III 2, 1, 6, as does e g Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 50

[b] On h m see Max Muller *Rg veda Pratiśakhya* pp 7 sq

Just as there are those three lights in heaven, so there are these three lights in man. As there is in heaven the sun, so there is the eye in the head As there is in the sky the lightning so there is the heart in the body As there is the fire in earth, so there is the seed in the member Having thus represented the whole world as the self, he said, 'This is the symbol of the earth, this of the heaven' He who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days[4]

3 Then come the reciters[1] of the Nirbhuja The Nirbhuja dwells on earth the Pratrnna in heaven, the Ubhayamantarena in the sky Then if one should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuja, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two lower places'[2] If one should rebuke him who recites the Pratrnna, he should reply, 'Thou hast fallen from the two upper places' But there is no rebuking him who repeats the Ubhayamantarena[3] For when he unites the words, that is the Nirbhuja form,[4] when he pronounces the two syllables pure, that is the Pratrnna form This is the first By the Ubhayamantarena both are fulfilled

the forms of the base *a* Possibly the production of such forms may be due to the analogy of *sásmin* (RV) and cf *sase at* (Chandogya Upanisad) Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 495 fin See however, also Bohtlingk s remarks in h s *Grammat Absonderlichkeiten im Aitareya brahmana*, Leipzig 1900, where he regards the irregularities noted by Aufrecht l c as due to misreadings of the text and I fully recognize that undue reverence to such texts is absurd On the other hand old forms do disappear and cf perhaps the use of *ima* and *imanam* Maitrāyanī Upanisad VI 7 II 6 and the Vedic *imana* (Panini VI 4 141 Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 61) There is also the elision of *a* in *nau* Mantrapātha I 13 9 (= Hiranyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra I 16 3) see Winternitz s edition I xxvii Wackernagel I, 318

[4] These sections 1 and 2 may be compared with Taittirīya Upanisad I 3 which treats the *samhita* with reference to the spaces (earth heaven ether wind) lights (fire sun water, lightning) knowledge (teacher, pupil knowledge training) generation (mother father child begetting and the self (lower jawbone upper jawbone speech tongue) This elaborate system must be later than the Aranyaka. Cf Max Muller *Rgveda Prātiśākhya* pp iii sq

[1] Or recitations of The Nirbhuja is the Samhita the Pratrnna the Pada and Ubhayamantarena the Krama Pātha Max Muller (see his *Rgveda Prātiśākhya* p ii and *Nachträge*, p ii) first pointed out the importance of this passage Cf also Oldenberg *S B E*, XXX 146 sq *Prolegomena* p. 380 Macdonell *Sanskrit Literature* p 51 It is summarized in Prātiśākhya I 4 see my *Śānkhāyana Āranyaka* p. 45 n 3 III 1 2 n 8

[2] *Acyo thai tarabhyam* is clearly a case of irregular Sandhi cf Atharvaveda IX, 1 1 *prthivyāntāraksit* III 2 4 n. 11 Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I 316 317 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* pp 64 65 *J A O S* XXX 99-102

[3] It is the perfect form, e g Sayana says, in the Samhitā in *agnim ile* the *ile* is *svarita + pracita* in the Pada they are both *anudatta* (cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 90, Macdonell *Vedic Grammar* p. 78 n 7)

[4] Sāyana explains *nirdistau bhujasadrśau purvottara akdau yasmin* Max Müller thinks it may refer to the arms of the words being cut off as it were or with two arms stretched out the two words forming as it were two arms to one body In the following *acye that* is clearly the reading though S and R in the commentary vary reading *acye thā* and *a ye tha* The Śānkhāyana Āranyaka, VII 8, has the correct form

He who desires proper food should recite the Nirbhuja, he who desires heaven should recite the Pratrnna, and he who desires both should recite the Ubhayamantarena Then if another should rebuke him who recites the Nirbhuja, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the earth, the deity The earth, the deity, will strike thee' If another should rebuke him who recites the Pratrnna, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended heaven, the deity The heaven, the deity, will strike thee' If another should rebuke him who recites the Ubhayamantarena, he should reply, 'Thou hast offended the sky, the deity The sky, the deity, will strike thee' Whatever he says to him[1] or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled But to a Brahmin one must not say anything save what is auspicious Only in exceeding[2] prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śuravira Māndukeya

4 Then come the imprecations[1] Let him know that breath[2] is the beam If any one rebuke him who has become breath as the beam, then if he thinks himself strong[3] he says, 'I have grasped the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome me who grasp the beam, breath Let him then say, 'The beam, breath,

[1] *bruvan va bruvantam va* This may perhaps be taken as I have taken it as equivalent to 'whether he speak to him or speak in reply' This is quite a simple construction But it is not so taken by the commentators Sayana renders *bruvan* as equivalent to *bruvantam*, and takes the second part as *va abruvantam* This is followed by Max Muller Ānandatirtha interprets it as *bruvan vā abruvan va bruvantam va abruvantam va* For similar curses, cf Śankhayana Aranyaka VII 10 and Chandogya Upanisad II 22 3

[2] Sayana takes this as permitting a curse on a Brahmin in the case of great wealth (such wealth being sinful) Anandatirtha denies this and carries on the negative Thus Śuravira's dictum confirms this This is less probable Max Muller accepts Sayana's view that the man is to say Let them be known to Brahmins It is simpler to take it as in the text For *na cana* cf V, 3 3 Delbruck *Altindische Syntax* pp 544 sq, Channing *J A O S* XIII xviii Jaiminiya Brāhmana II 77 (*J A O S* XV 240) *na te śariranı cana grham prapsyanti* and Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, IV 14 5 The rule that *na* precedes seems true for the Brahmana prose

The two accus. with √*bru* (for *bru* cf Bloomfield *A J P*, V 180, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I 182 Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p 36) are said by Delbruck (*Altindische Syntax* p 174 cf Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* p 8 Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda* p 265) not to be found in the Brahmana language, which this passage disproves *Bru* is expressly mentioned as governing two accusatives in the Kārika cited by the Kaśika Vrtti on Panini I, 4 51, where a much more marked case than that here (where the second acc is merely a pronoun) is adduced, viz. *manavakam dharmam brute*

[1] Sayana takes this as a noun of agency like *nirbhujapravadah* in III 1, 3 Anandatirtha says *atmano jñanasamarthyānusarenoktiprakara ucyanta iti śesah*

[2] Cf Śakalya's view, III, 1 2 The metaphor is from house building The opt. below is clearly indefinite (like the subj in Latin and opt in Greek), see III 2 1, n 1 and see my note on the Kaṭhaka *J R A S*, 1909 For *vamśa* see Zimmer *Alt Leb*, p. 150

[3] The construction is curiously changed below to the accusative unless, as is possible the other person is meant But see *St Petersburg Dict* s v *man* 3 The nominative is,

will forsake thee' But if he thinks himself weak, he should say to him, 'Thou hast not been able to overcome he who have been fain[4] to grasp the beam, breath Breath, the beam, will forsake thee' Whatever he says to him or says in reply to him, that shall assuredly be fulfilled But to a Brahmin one must not say anything except what is auspicious Only in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin 'Not even in exceeding prosperity may one say ill to a Brahmin, let Brahmins be honoured,' so says Śuravira Māndūkeya[5]

5 Now the reciters of the Nirbhuja say, 'The former syllable is the former half, the latter the latter half The space between the former half and the latter half is the union' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days Now Hrasva Māndūkeya says, 'We that recite the Nirbhuja say that the former syllable is the former half and the latter syllable the latter half, but that the union[1] is the space between the former and latter halves in so far as thereby one produces the union and distinguishes accented and unaccented and separates the mora and what is not' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days Now his son,

however, quite regular, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 268, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* §§ 208 and 99 Cf also the idiom *krsno* (&c) *rupam kr* (Taittiriya Samhita, V, 2, 6, 5 VI, 1, 3, 1, 6 5, 2, 4, 1, 4 7, 1, VII, 1, 6, 2, 3 4 Brahmana, I, 1, 3 3, Aitareya Brahmana, VI 35 see Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 111) The construction with the nom (cf Delbruck, *Vedische Syntax*, pp 104 sq Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 33) is no doubt rare in later Sanskrit, but I have found it in an independent passage in Anandatirtha and the analogous use of the gerund is found in the Ramayana, &c Cf the curious phrase, Manu VIII, 91 *eko 'ham asmity ātmanam manyase* *Chaknuvam* in Rajendralāla is merely an assimilated *n* altered into *anusvara* The error of B in reading *chaknuvantam* shows how little dependence can be put on this MS As to *aha* cf III, 2, 4 n 10 *Enam* is here in apposition to *pranam* but I agree with Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 136, that the strict rule (Bohtlingk *Z D M G*, XLI 181) cannot be proved for Vedic or Sanskrit

[4] *Samadhitsisam* is of course the aorist indic of the desiderative of the root *dha* Max Muller translates *samadhitsisantam* as a participle, but this is impossible Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1035 a, *Roots, &c*, p 249, *J A O S*, XIII, lxx

[5] These curses are just intelligible, but the curses in Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 8 and 9 offer serious difficulties As the text stands the first case is that of rebuking another, when if strong the rebuker (this must be the subject) says to the other, 'Thou hast grasped the breath or beam but canst not overcome me who am fain,' if weak, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not' In the second case the sense must be (reading *parah* or making *param* mean the subject of the main clause), the man who holds that *prana* is *samla* says to his rebuker, 'I have been fain to grasp the beam, breath, thou canst not overcome one who is fain,' if the rebuker is strong If not, he says, 'Thou hast sought to grasp, but couldst not.' Other renderings are quite possible and the text can be altered (e g read *samadham* in VII 8), but it is not possible to be certain of the sense, see my trans., pp 44-46

[1] i e this view is differentiated in one or two points from the view above Cf Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka, VII, 11-13

Madhyama, his son by his wife Pratibodhi,[1] says, 'One pronounces these syllables by their letters, neither separating entirely nor uniting absolutely,[2] and the mora which is between the former and latter halves and indicates the union is the sliding I consider therefore the sliding to be the union' A Ṛṣi says this also (RV, II, 23, 16), 'O Bṛhaspati, they know nought higher than the sliding' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives all his days

6 Tarukṣya[1] says, 'The union is formed by the Bṛhat and Rathantara Sāmans. The Rathantara is speech, the Bṛhat breath.[2] By these two, speech and breath, the

[1] Metronymics like this were inevitable where polygamy was possible They do not prove matriarchy or anything similar A similar instance is the famous Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra of Chandogya Upaniṣad III 17 (not 7 as in Max Müller) 6, who is the subject of an interesting discussion in Garbe's translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*, and cf *J R A S*, 1907, pp 976 sq, 1908 p 173, n See also Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 169 A child sometimes, if illegitimate, was named after its mother, e g Satyakāma Jabala, Chandogya Upaniṣad, IV, 4 For a long list of metronymics of a curious character see Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, VI, 4, 30–32 The reading of B is a mere error in an inaccurate MS Max Muller suggests Pratibodhi as the correct form, and this seems the form in the Śaṅkhayana. For the i, cf however Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 75 Pratibodha is a recognized name in the Gana *tikādi* For other metronymics cf Fleet *J R A S* 1905 pp 637, 638, Hopkins, *J A O S* XIII, 105, 370, n; for a discussion of matriarchy as affecting the Aryan Hellenes, see Farnell, *Archiv f Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp 70 sq and reff

[2] The reading is clearly *anekikurvan* *Ekikurvan* is an easy but bad blunder Sayana explains that you must not (1) pronounce *tava it* as *tava + it* nor (2) as *tavet*, but (3) as *tavet* This cannot be meant It is really intended that you should pronounce so as to give a sound of *ai* together Compare the fact that in the so-called elision of Latin both elements were distinctly preserved in pronunciation (cf Lindsay *Latin Language* p 144), as in modern Spanish Cf also Deussen *Sechzig Upanishads* p. 215 This passage is of particular interest as confirming the notice in the Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya III, 8 (200) (Max Muller's edit, p lxv) that Māṇḍūkeya laid down the use of the circumflex in the Praśliṣṭa Sandhi (e g *a + i*, &c) as well as in the Abhinihita Sandhi (*e* or *o + a*), and the exceptional cases of *i + i*, in which the circumflex is regularly laid down and the fact that the *a* is not merely elided generally recognized by the Prātiśākhyas (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 324, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 104) So Pāṇini VIII, 2, 6, has *svarito vānudātte padādau*, and see Wackernagel, I, 292 293, Macdonell, p 104 The requirement of the circumflex is only intelligible on the *anekikurvan* theory

The form *anekikurvan* is interesting *Eki + √kr* is found in the Śatapatha Brahmana, see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1093 and contrast III, 2, 3 *ankyā bhavayan*, *ekibhū* occurs in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad IV, 4, 2 in the sense of dying, and cf. Maitreya Upaniṣad (Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, xlvi) *tena ekibhavati parasmin*, cf also Jacob, *Concordance*, p 268 For RV, II, 23, 16, cf. Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III 68

[1] Tārukṣya is more probable than Tarkṣya because the alteration to Tārkṣya is natural, the word occurring above on I, 5, 2 Possibly Tārukṣya is merely a case of Svarabhakti cf Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 56 sq It is clear that Sayana read Tārukṣya as he derives it from Tarukṣa The Ānandāśrama corrects it into Tṛkṣa without warrant. The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII 19 has Tārkṣya, cf Kauṣītaki Brāhmana, XXX, 9

[2] These Sāmans are used in the Pṛṣṭha Stotra of the Agniṣṭoma

union is made' Taruksya guards[3] (his teacher's) cows for a year for the sake of this Upanisad For it alone does Taruksya guard the cows for a year A Rsi says (RV X, 181, 1, 2), 'Vasistha bore hither the Rathantara, Bharadvaja carried hither the Brhat of Agni'[4] He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives out all his days Kauntharavya says 'Speech is united with breath, breath with the blowing air, the air with the All gods, the All-gods with the world of heaven, the world of heaven with *brahman* This is the gradual union' He, who knows this gradual union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven, just as does this union If he for the sake of another or for his own sake recites (the union) let him know as he is about to recite,[5] that this union has gone up to heaven,

[2] This is a quaint piece of human nature There are plenty of parallels cf Chandogya Upanisad, IV, 4 The omission of the second sentence in B is clearly a slip, showing how untrustworthy is the MS when uncorroborated For the *nimittamplani*, cf Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 3 2 Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 77, 4, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* p 92, Geldner (*Vedische Studien*, III, 33 n) finds such a loc in RV, I, 6 9 *sdm asminn rñjate girah* *Raksayate* is a hist pres The middle here gives clearly the idea of personal interest (cf Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 166 b, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 236 sq) For the hist pres cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 502, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 172, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 327, Brugmann *Greek Gramm*[2], § 156, and especially his paper, *Berichte der Konigl sachs Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, 1883 pp 169 sq, Giles, *Comp Phil*, § 547 The present tense essentially denotes what is continuous or progressive (cf Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp 62 63) as opposed to the momentary and that whether the verb has the sense of an action or a state The historic use with a particle of time is Homeric, but not the simple historic present though it is found in the earliest Latin (e g the epitaph of Lucius Cornelius Scipio (B C 298)) *cepit, subigit omne(m) Loucanam opsidesque abdoucit*) and must be Indo European

The acc of time is common, see Introd, p 56, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* pp 170, 171, Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp 175 sq, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 28, Hopkins, *A J P*, XXIV, 7

[3] These Sāmans are required to accompany the important Pravargya Cf my *Śankhāyana Āranyaka* p 48, n 6

[4] *abhivyaharsan* is an extraordinary form Whitney, *J A O S*, XIII, lxx, takes it as an aor ind but I cannot make sense of this To take it as at first seems most natural as a mistake for a future participle (°*harsyan*) is faced with the difficulty that √*hr* gives only *harisy* as the future in accordance with the established rule (Panini, VII 2 70) that roots in *r* take intermediate *i* (Max Muller, *Sanskrit Grammar*[2], § 332), and that even if *hars* were assumed *hars* would need explanation though *s* and *sy* are constantly confused in MSS (e g *aratsyam* and *aratsam*, Maitrayani Samhita, IV, p 138[8], Whitney, *P A O S* Oct., 1887, p xxv, *asusyam* and *asusam*, Chandogya Upanisad, I, 11, 2, Whitney, *P A O S*, Oct, 1890, p lii, *niksana* and *niksyana* Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 16, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p 431, above I, 1, 5), *apraksyah* and *apraksah*, Chāndogya Upanisad Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, xiv, n 1, Knauer *Manava Grhya Sutra*, p xxxv, and occasional longs are formed, e g in *saksye*, Atharvaveda, II, 27, 5, for *saksye*, &c., *asaksi* (Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 887) There remains only to take *abhivyaharsan* as an aorist participle (without of course any past sense), 'while reciting,' cf e g RV, II, 4 7 *dhāk ad urvīm* But such forms are also very

and that so it will be with those who know it (and become) gods So will it come to pass He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives out all his days. Pañcālacanda[4] says, 'The union is speech' 'By speech are the Vedas composed, by speech the metres By speech friends are united, by speech all beings, therefore is speech all this' Now[5] when one repeats or speaks, breath is in speech, speech then swallows breath When one is silent or in sleep, speech is in breath, breath then swallows speech They swallow each other Speech indeed is the mother, breath the son A Ṛṣi says (RV, X, 119, 4), 'There is one bird,[6] he enters the sky, he sees this whole world, with ripe mind I beheld him nigh at hand; the mother absorbs him, and he the mother' He, who thus knows this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven He lives out all his days

rare The form *abhikaryate* in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad (=*abhikaryati*) may be explained perhaps by the cases of irregular lengthening above, and by the (Epic) use of middle terminations for active (*J A O S*, XXV, 132), rather than as a causative passive as in the Dictt. In Atharvaveda XVIII 2, 58 the editions both read *vidhakṣān* and the pseudo-Sāyana apparently so read though he renders by *udan*, but the parallel passages, RV, X, 16, 7 and Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, VI, 1, 4 have both the correct *vidhakṣyān* (Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p. 846), and the accent proves clearly that *vidhakṣān* is incorrect Macdonell (*Vedic Grammar*, p 57 n 1) suggests that in the case of *yokṣe*, *vidhakṣān*, *sakṣe*, *mekṣami*, the *y* has dropped phonetically, cf *J A O S*, XXV, 142

*śaśvat tatha syat* might of course mean, 'may it ever endure' (as taken by Max Muller), but the usual use of the phrase in the Aitareya Brahmana supports the rendering above adopted, e g II, 21, 2 *ya enam tatra bruyād vaca vajrena yajamanasya pranan vyagat prana enam hasyatiti śaśvat tatha syat*, 22, 3, 28, 3 5 29 7, IV, 7, 7, VI 23, 13, 26, 6, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 343 n 1 (for the construction with *īśvara* there mentioned, cf Śaṅkhayana Āraṇyaka I, 8) Eggeling on Śatapatha Brahmana, V, 4 3, 2 (*S B E.*, XLI, 98, n 2), now adopts 'wohl' as the regular equivalent of *śaśvat* at any rate in the Brāhmanas, and see also Oertel's note on Jaiminiya Upaniṣad Brahmana, I, 54 3 Sayana takes *vidyāt* as a part of the protasis In any case the sense is very much the same

*sa* or *sa yadi* is of course not a particle but the demonstrative The cases in which Max Muller (*S B E*, XV, 110, n 7 on Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, II, 4, 7) and Delbruck (*Altindische Syntax*, pp 215, 216), following the *St Petersburg Dict*, find *sa* as a particle are merely instances of an ordinary anacoluthon, and do not prove that *sa* was ever felt as a particle Precisely the same idiom is common in early English and no one there thinks of 'he' as a particle, see Kellner, *English Syntax*, pp 68 sq Correct Caland, *Ueber des Rit Sutra des Baudhāyana* p 46

[4] Pañcalacanda must mean Caṇḍa (no doubt Prākrit for Candra, cf Atharvaveda, II, 24, 1 (Cāṇḍa)) of the Pañcālas, as Sayana takes it The Aitareya Brāhmana, VIII, 23, knows a king, Durmukha Pañcāla.

[5] This is the proof of the nature of speech as other than and distinct from breath Their activities are different *Anyo 'nyam* is very interesting as already it tends to become a separate word, though it still is here two words, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, i, 321 sq

[6] This verse is more misconstrued even than usual He enters the sky, it is said, as wind, the world he sees as *prana*, he is seen close in the heart (Sayana) On the √*rih* of the RV verse cf Hopkins, *J A O S*, XXVIII, 125 sq

Then comes the Prajāpati union [9] The first half is the wife, the latter half is the husband The union is the son The act of union is the begetting This union is Aditi For Aditi is all whatever there is, father, mother, child and begetting A Rsi [10] says this also (RV, I, 89, 10), 'Aditi is mother, is father, is son' He, who knows thus this union, obtains children, cattle, fame, glory, and the world of heaven [11] He lives out all his days

### Adhyaya 2

Sthavira Śakalya says that breath is a beam,[1] and that as the other beams rest on the main beam of the house, the eye, the ear, the mind, the speech, the senses,

[9] Proclaimed by Prajapati (Sayana), but see Śankhāyana Āranyaka *VII 16* Cf Taittiriya Upanisad, I, 3 5, and on III 1, 2 *Prajanana* occurs in the concrete sense in RV, III 29, 1 (Oldenberg, *S B E* XLVI, 305)

[10] This verse is cited and explained in full in Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I, 41, which is in fact parallel For Aditi cf especially Oldenberg *Religion des Veda* pp 203 sq, Macdonell *Vedic Mythology* pp 120 sq

[11] Taittiriya Upanisad 1 c, 7 continues after *brahmavarcasena, annadyena suvargena lokena*, where S Sitarama renders 'all kinds of food' Cf for this section Śankhayana Aranyaka, VII, 14-16 18 19

[1] This Adhyaya (cf Śankhayana Āranyaka *VIII* 1) deals with meditations on the several classes of letters The construction *yatha syuh—samahitah* is noteworthy For the verb understood cannot be considered as other than an indicative, so that the optative in the first clause must be indefinite The same force seems to be found in V, 1, 4 *pratisthapayati—yada—śrāmyet* Śankhayana Aranyaka II, 16 *tad yatha vraje pasun avasrjyargalesiks parinyayet evam evaitaih padanusangaih sarvan kaman ubhayatah parigrhyatman dhatte*, VII 1, &c Aitareya Brahmana V, 34 4 *tam yady etesam trayanam ekamcid akamam abhyabhavet tasyasti Vamadavasya stotre prayaścittih* Manu, VIII 3, 1, 78 (other examples in Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* p 349) So with *yátha* Delbrück p 350, with *yátra*, &c, ibid p 351 So in *krtakrtyah syuh* in Sayana's introductions to the RV, curiously misunderstood by Peterson (*Rgveda Handbook*, p 126) The use differs distinctly from but is easily derived from the use of the opt with either an opt (potential) (cf the use in Avestan, Jackson *P A O S*, April 1896, p 187, Delbruck, *Vergl Synt*, II 372) or an opt (imperative) in the apodosis, since in either of these cases the future tense is primarily present, whereas when an indic forms the apodosis the sense is clearly merely indefinite The use, especially as here in sentence, is common in Homer where the subj with primary and the opt with secondary tenses have both this sense (cf Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], pp 248 sq, 269 sq), is found in the subj in early Latin prose as well as verse in which Greek imitation is always possible (e g Cato Maior, *de Mor*, *ingenium prope uti ferrum est si exerceas conteritur, nisi exerceas rubiginem contrahit*), in early English (Kellner, *English Syntax*, p 239) &c

The use of the pass part with or without copula (Introd, pp 64, 65) is significant Delbruck (*Altindische Syntax*, pp 394 395), followed by Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 176) regards the use as corresponding both to imperf and aor, but while of course it is dangerous to dogmatize on matters which ultimately depend on a delicate analysis of a language so remote as Vedic Sanskrit, it seems to me that there is a very clear distinction between (1) the aor, the tense of which has just happened, (2) the imperf, the tense of narration,

the body, the whole self, rests on this breath 'Of this self the truth is like the sibilants, the bones the mutes, the marrow the vowels, and flesh and blood, the fourth part,[1] the semi vowels,' so says Hrasva Māndūkeya We have,[2] however, learned that the number was three Of those three, bones, marrow, and joints, there are three hundred and sixty (parts) on this side and on that side These make up seven hundred and twenty. Seven hundred and twenty are the days and nights of the year This self[3] then, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the days in number[4] He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, as like the days, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the days,[5] becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days.

2 Then comes Kauntharavya There are three hundred and sixty syllables,[1] three hundred and sixty sibilants, three hundred and sixty unions What we have called syllables are the days, what we have called sibilants are the nights, what we have called unions are the junctions of the nights and days So far as regards

and (3) these forms with participles which express a completed action whose results persist into the present Of course many actions can be regarded from either point of view and be differently described, but that is not to say that the effect is not different when different forms are used To take some of Delbruck's instances RV, I 81, 5 *nd tvāvan Indra kās cand nd jatd nd janisyate* the sense is not either 'was born' (imperf) or 'has just been born' (aor), but 'exists, having been born', in Taittiriya Samhita II 6 9, 3 *té devā́ avrtah prácyuto vai párastat sómó tha no nā́gachati gandharvā́ vai páry amosisur íti*, which Delbruck gives as a case of the part corresponding to an aor the sense is clearly different between the continuing absence of the Soma and the one definite past act of the Gandharvas in stealing it The real tendency of the Mantra and Brahmana is to assimilate the part to a present though, as is the case with *all* the expressions of past time in the Mantras, occasionally it may have a narrative sense (e g RV, III 48, 22 *Pŕ̥nya dugdhám sakŕ̥t piyah*) The present sense—yet with the past action—is very clearly seen in cases like Bṛhaddevata VIII, 47 *prathamayām rca stutah | ardharce dyauś ca bhumiś ca Aśvinau cottare tatah* || It is not *stūyante*, for the actual praising is over (*astaut* is regularly used of the Ṛsi), and yet it does not mean 'were praised

[1] Max Muller takes *anyat* as the rest', but it rather means the other, the fourth

[2] This view is apparently Śakalya s (Sayana), the first three being his, to which Mandukeya adds a fourth The threefold view, with *ghosa* for *svara*, *vyañjana* for *sparśa*, is found in II, 2, 4 where the difference of terms denotes a difference in dates

[3] Anandatirtha explains all this of Visnu as usual

[4] The symbolism of the year is common in all religions, cf, e g, Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* IV, 284 285

[5] Cf the Khila MS (B) at end (fol 191[b] = Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p 168) *etāsam evā devátanam sarsṭitam sāyujyam salokátam aśnute yá etān evá 'ān svadhyayam adhīté* For the compound, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, i 149, 150

[1] Syllables are vowels, sibilants consonants and their unions the Sandhi (Sayana) Sayana takes *sati* as separate, to explain how it comes to be = 360 But though the construction is illogical it is regular in the Brāhmanas (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 480 b, cf for Prakrit, Pischel, *Prakrit Grammar*, p 409), and *sati* should not be printed apart as in S.

the gods Now as regards the self The syllables which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self bones, the sibilants which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self marrow, the marrow is indeed the real breath, for it is seed, and without breath seed is not effused Or if it is effused without breath, it will decay and will not produce The unions which we have explained with reference to the gods are with reference to the self joints Of these three,[2] bones, marrow, and joints, there are five hundred and forty parts on this side and on that They make one thousand and eighty, and one thousand and eighty[3] are the rays of the sun They make the *bṛhatī* verses and this day Thus the self[4] which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech is like the syllables in number He, who knows thus this self, which consists of sight hearing, metre, mind, and speech, as like the syllables, obtains union, likeness, and nearness to the syllables, becomes rich in sons and cattle, and lives out all his days

3 Bādhva[1] says, 'There are four persons, the person of the body, the person of the metres, the person of the Veda, and the great person That which we have called the person of the body is the corporeal self Its essence is the incorporeal conscious self That which we have called the person of the metres is the collection of letters Its essence is the letter 'a'[2] That which we have called the person of the Veda is that by which one knows the Vedas, Ṛgveda, Yajurveda, and Sāmaveda Its essence is the Brahman priest Therefore should one choose a Brahman[3] priest who is full of *brahman* and can discern flaws

It is curious as S points out that no comment is made on the similar passage in III, 2, 1 For *Kaunthaº* cf the Dhātupāṭha root *kunth* which Franke (*Vienna Orient Journ*, VIII, 323) compares with Greek κυλλός Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik* I, 170 The name seems not to occur elsewhere, except in the parallel passage in Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka VIII, 2

[2] The words inserted by B are quite out of place here and show how little that MS can be relied upon For *majjñam* cf Atharvaveda II 12 7 Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 102 For the construction cf Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra II, 17, 11, 37 *J R A S*, 1909 contra Böhtlingk *Sächs Ber* 1891 p 197

[3] This extraordinary doctrine Sāyana can only support by the Ātharvana passage (Praśna Upaniṣad, I 8 = Maitrī Upaniṣad, VI 8 Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* p 1001 a) *sahasraraśmiḥ śatadhā vartamānaḥ prāṇaḥ prajānām udayaty eṣa sūryaḥ*, which he explains includes by denotation the eighty There are 1080 syllables in thirty *bṛhatīs*

[4] Viṣṇu according to Ānandatīrtha, who has considerable difficulty in working out the details of his interpretation here

[1] Bādhva is undoubtedly correct, *Vādhyaḥ* is merely a slip of Rājendralāla's, and did not deserve record in Monier Williams' *Dict* *Vāts(y)aḥ* is read in Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 3

[2] Cf II, 3 6 The precision in the use of the aorist is to be noted, cf Introd p 60

[3] The Brahman priest is required to guard the sacrifice and sits in the South (the place of the dead), Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 8, 7, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 141, n 2 He is not here in any way connected with the Atharvaveda (the later connection is probably due to his employment (Winternitz, p 139 n 2) in the household ritual which is found mainly in

It hath filled heaven and earth and the sky The sun is the self of all that stands and moves' This I regard as the regular[1] Saṃhitā as composed, thus says Badhva For the Bahvṛcas consider him in the great hymn, the Adhvaryus in the fire, the Chandogas in the Mahāvrata rite They see him in this earth, in heaven, in the air, in the ether, in the waters, in plants, in trees, in the moon, in the constellations, in all beings Him they call *brahman* The self which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, is like the year in number He,[2] who recites to another the self, which consists of sight, hearing, metre, mind, and speech, and is like the year,

4. To him the Vedas yield no milk, he has no part in what his teacher has taught him He knows not the path of virtue A Ṛsi says this also (RV, X, 71, 6) 'He who forsakes the friend who knows his friends,[3] in speech he has no part What he hears, he hears in vain, he knows not the path of virtue' This means that he has no part in what he has studied and that he does not know the path of virtue So a man who knows this should not[4] lay the fire for another, nor sing the Sāmans of the Mahavrata for another, nor recite the Śastras of that day for another Only[5] may he recite for a father or a teacher, for that is done for oneself We have said[6] that this incorporeal conscious self and that sun are one and the same Where these two are separated,[7] the sun is seen like the moon,[8] its rays do not manifest themselves,

[1] All the above must be Badhva's view, just as III, 2, 2 gave Kauṇṭharavya's views. The following alludes to the fact that the Adhvaryu s mystic speculations centre in the Agnicayana, cf *Eggeling, S B E*, *XLIII*, xxiv

[2] The section runs on in a way that cannot be early V, 1, 1 and 2 is precisely similar, and the present section division must remain of doubtful (though early) date The divisions of the Śankhayana are similarly illogical For the loc cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 205

[3] Sayana points out that Taittirīya Aranyaka, I, 3, II, 15, reads in this verse *sakhividam*, a point overlooked in *Bloomfield Vedic Concordance*, p 700b *Sayana s reference does tend* to show that he also wrote a Taittirīya Aranyaka commentary, which on other grounds might be deemed very doubtful (cf III 2 3 n 5)

[4] i e not as Adhvaryu, Udgatṛ or Hotṛ priest It is impossible to square the total prohibition here with V, 1, 5, which (see n 5) contemplates a breach of the rule but it agrees with the *opinion of 'some' (eke)* in V, 3 3 see *n 1 on that passage*

[5] A frequent exception Cf V, 3, 3 n 1

[6] III, 2, 3 The relevance of this passage is not obvious Sayana takes it as a reflexion induced by the idea of the attainment of *brahman* in the brief space of life, whence omens as to the duration of life are inserted The connexion of sun and self is elsewhere used to give omens *of death* In Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, V, 5, 2, the sun appears as white *only* to the man about to die The parallel passages in the Śankhāyana are VIII, 7, and XI, 3, 4

[7] This is not very logical, as there is no reason why the separation of the two should be a sign of death The rest of the signs are clearly old folklore ideas pressed into service For the extensive literature on Vedic superstitions, see Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, pp 167 sq., 183-185, Hatfield, *Aušanasādbhutāni*, *J A O S*, XV, 208, &c, Bloomfield,

the sky is red like madder, the wind is not retained, his head smells like a raven's nest, and a man should know that his self[7] is gone and that he will not have long to live. Let him do then whatever he considers must be done, and recite seven verses beginning, 'What is near, what is far' (RV, IX, 67, 21-27), the single verse, 'Of the ancient seed' (RV, VIII, 6, 30), six verses beginning, 'Where purifying Brahman' (RV, IX, 113, 6-11) and the single verse, 'We from the darkness' (RV, I, 50, 10) Next when the sun is seen pierced, and looks like the nave of a cart-wheel, or he sees his shadow pierced, let him know that this is so Next when he sees himself in a mirror or in the water with a crooked head[8] or without a head, or when his pupils are seen inverted[9] or crooked let him know that this is so Next let him cover his eyes and look, then threads[10] are seen as if falling together If he sees them not, let him

*Atharvaveda*, pp 82 sq, Kauśika Sutra, VIII, and Adbhuta Brahmana, Aufrecht's idea (*Z D M G*, XXXIII 573) that the passage is not in place is disproved by the parallel in the Śāṅkhāyana, VIII, 6 and 7 XI, 3 and 4

[6] i e its rays are pale and cold *Kākakulāyagandhikam* is probably an adj. as a quasi pred For examples cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 78 79 *Kulāya* is a curious word in Manava Gṛhya Sutra II, 14, 23, Knauer takes it (wrongly, I think) as = stall (cf p 55 of his edit )

[7] Anandatirtha renders *samparetu* as *sammukrstanirgamah*, Sayana as *mrtah* In *yat manyeta* the opt is probably indef. It may also be 'attracted', cf Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 281 The form in *anya* is rare in the Brahmanas cf Delbruck *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 400 401, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 965 The use of *man* with participles of all sorts is curious, cf the use with the gerund Whitney § 994 e, Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 223, with the pres part., III 1 4 With the past part., even in Bṛhaddevata, e g VII, 125

[8] The reading of the text is supported by Sayana and also by Anandatirtha and is certain For water divination cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, IV, 230 For *adarśa* (also in the Bṛhadaranyaka and Kaṭha Upanisads) cf Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, xxiv

[9] Sayana explains a white pupil in a black eyeball It probably means only, upside down, although the contrast of white and black in the eye is frequent, II 1, 5 Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka, VIII, 7, suggests reading here *jihme na va* 'or are not seen at all' and this may be right

[10] Sayana explains the operation thus, *caksusi nimilya netrasya prantam ava tabhya netra sampam pasyet*, Ānandatirtha has *angulya aksimulam avastabhya* The *bataraka* (*barataka* in or *varatakan* in Śaṅkhayana) are Sayana says, *vartulani suksmani śuklavarnani kesandra kasabdabhidheyani* and he takes *sampatantiva* as *samyan netran nirgacchantiva* This is hardly possible For *varatakan*, cf Śriharsa Khandanakhandakhadya p 239 cited by Jacob *Laukikanyayanjali* p 1 The construction is difficult, as the *yatha* is not properly in place It may be that *yatha* goes with *batarakani* and *iva* qualifies only *sampatanti*, and the sense is, things are seen like, &c, but it is also possible that *tad yatha* is practically = then it is that. This use is of course common in later Sanskrit, e g Bana, Kadambari (p 337, 12, ed Peterson, p 600, ed Nirnaya Sagara) *agamesu sarvesu eva puranaramayanabharatadisu samyag asi ekaprakarah saparvritah tad yatha*, &c Cf the Pali use of *seyyatha* Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, IV, 3 42 sq has a series of *tad yatha*, so ibid., IV, 4 4, 5, &c

Cases of conditional sentences without particles are of course very frequent in Vedic as

know that this is so Next let him cover his ears and listen, then there is a sound as of a burning fire or of a chariot If he does not hear that sound, let him know that this is so Next when the fire appears blue like the neck of a peacock,"[11] or when he sees lightning in a cloudless sky, or no lightning in a cloudy sky, or in a great cloud sees bright rays as it were, let him know that it is so Next when he sees the ground as though burning, let him know that this is so So far as regards the visible signs Then come the dreams[12] He sees a black man with black teeth, he kills him, a boar kills him, a monkey jumps on him; the wind carries him swiftly along, having swallowed gold he spits it out, he eats honey, he chews stalks, he carries a single[13] lotus,

in other languages. Cf Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 284, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 487, Aufrecht, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p 431 my note *J R A S* 1909

The Maitreya Upanisad (Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, xlvi) has a passage which may be reminiscent of this text *agnir vaiśvanaro* . *tasyaisa ghoso bhavati yam* (wrong reading ? *yad*) *etat karnav apidhaya srnoti sa yadotkramisyan bhavati nainam ghosam srnoti*

For *upabdis*, infra which denotes literally the noise of going and is particularly in place here, cf Aitareya Brahmana, IV, 9 3 Jaiminiya Brahmana, I, 253, Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 37, 3, with Oertel s note, RV, I 74, 7, with Oldenberg s note (*S B E*, XLVI 94), Schmidt, *K Z*, XXV, 55 Scheftelowitz (*Zur Stammbildung in den indo-germanischen Sprachen* § 9) compares RV, IX, 77, 4 *urubjd*, which he considers as going back to IG *pago*, cf Greek πηγή The construction above *drśyate* and *abhikhyayeta* in parallel uses and below *drśyate paśyen na paśyen paśyeta* are decidedly curious (cf Introd p 63) The temptation to amend to *drśyeta* is very strong and on the whole I incline to think that it would be dangerous to insist on these examples The case of *upekseta—drśyante* differs, for the two verbs are not parallel The first is an instruction, the second expresses categorically the result (and *drśyante* may have helped to bring about the incorrect *drśyate*) In III, 1, 4 where *upavadet* and *aha* occur, the *aha* is very strange, and one would like to take *śaknosity aha—hasyatity* as two sentences both dependent on *brūyat* There is, however the real difficulty that *a—√ha* would be a strange combination, and the division of the sentences is also curious though no more curious than the *aha* I suspect some corruption of the text Sāyana renders differently He takes the whole as one Mantra and supplies *bhavan* as a subject for *aha*, and so in the next sentence he interpolates *bhavan aha* in sense In the numerous passages in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa which are more or less parallel (see the reff cited in III, 1, 6 n 5), no such *aha* occurs, and *hasyati* has no prefix But probably *a—hasyati* must go together *Āha* might, of course, be taken as a first person and made part of the quotation (cf Speyer § 178), but this is not likely, and for the indef opt, cf III, 2, 1, n 1

[11] *Mayuragrivah* is perhaps intended by the reading of B *mayuragriva ameghe* (but Sankhayana has *mayuragriva* when it can be °*vah*), and undoubtedly *grivah* is the form alone recognized by Panini and usual in the earlier literature *J R A S*, 1906 pp 916 919 Probably the reading was originally *mayuragrivameghe* by an incorrect Sandhi for *mayuragrivah* For similar irregular Sandhi, cf Buhler, *S B E*, II xli (from Āpastamba), Macdonell, *Brhaddevata*, I xxvii, and V, 3, 2, n 9, III, 2, 3, n 2 For the next portent, cf Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I, 112

[12] The plural must be right Cf Markandeya Purana, XLIII, 1 sq, Hillebrandt, op cit, p 184

[13] 'Red' in colour (Sayana), for red as unlucky, cf *Z D M G*, XL, 117

he drives with a team of asses and[14] boars; wearing a wreath of red flowers, he drives a black cow with a black calf towards the south[15] If he sees any of these, he should fast and cook a pot of milk, and offer it, reciting a verse of the Ratrī hymn (RV., X, 127, 16) to each oblation, and having fed the Brahmins with other food,[16] himself eat the oblation Let him know that the person within all beings who is not heard,[17] not reached, not thought, not subdued, not seen, not understood, not classified, but who hears, thinks, sees, classifies, sounds, understands, and knows is his own self[18]

5 Now comes this Upanisad of the whole speech All these indeed are Upanisads of the whole speech, but this they so call. The mutes are the earth, the sibilants the sky, the vowels heaven The mutes are fire, the sibilants air, the vowels the sun The mutes are the Rgveda, the sibilants the Yajurveda, the vowels the Sāmaveda. The mutes are the eye, the sibilants the ear, the vowels the mind The mutes are the up breathing, the sibilants the down-breathing, the vowels the back-breathing Then comes this divine lute[1] The

[14] 'Or' (Sayana), which may be more correct.

[15] The ten dreams are so taken by the commentator and by Max Muller whose note (p. 261) is apparently wrong *Etesam kimcid* is noteworthy The neut. of the pronoun is practically nominal and is to be compared with the neut. in predication, III, 1, 2, n 4. So in Latin, e g Horace, *Sat*, 1, 7 *Lydorum quicquid* The parallel passage in the Śaṅkhāyana has corrected the original *kimcid* of the MS, but the correspondence is conclusive.

[16] Cooked in the house (Sayana) See Sankhayana Gṛhya Sutra, V, 5, 9 and my article, *J R A S*, 1907, p 929, for *sthalīpaka*, see Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, VI, 4, 19 Gṛhyasamgraha, I 114, Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, xvi, n 4. For the causative with instr and acc. cf. Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 224 sq; Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 277 a, 282 b, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax* § 21, *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 49 According to Panini, I, 4 52, and the examples cited in the Kaśikā Vṛtti, ad loc, here we should have two accusatives.

[17] *Atah* is rendered by Sayana, *atmad dehendriyādisanghatad vilakṣana iti śesah*, while Ānandatīrtha suggests *adhikah*

[18] This is the most advanced point in the definition of the Ātman arrived at in the Āranyaka. The Ātman is not object, but subject only—as Sāyana says, *atmā visayo na bhavati visayi tu bhavaty eva* This occurs frequently later and with it the doctrine that the self cannot be known Sāyana cites the *antaryamibrahmana*, Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, III, 7, 23 the *aksarabrahmana*, ibid., III, 8, 11, the Kausitaki Upanisad, I, 8, the Praśna Upanisad, IV, 6, and the Nṛsimhottaratapaniya Upanisad, II See also Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, pp 133 sq, E.T, pp. 147 sq Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, IV, 18, is devoted to this topic (= Kena Upanisad)

[1] i e the human body This metaphor explains Praśna Upanisad, II 2, where *vāna* (V, 1, 4) is equated to *śarīra*, which Max Muller (*S B E.*, XV, 274, n 3) finds unintelligible Connected with Visnu is Ānandatīrtha's explanation of the word *daivī* *Ambhana* is a curious word I think it is from *anu* + √*bhan* (as in Class. Sansk for √*bhan*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 194) Compare *ambara* for *anu* + *vara* and *jambila* for *janu* + *bila* (ibid, 59). The omission before *v* (common) led to omission before *b* and sporadically before *bh* The meaning would be 'sounding board' (?) Cf. v Schroeder, *Ind Lit*, p 755

6 Now Kṛṣṇaharita[1] proclaims this Brāhmaṇa[2] as it were regarding speech to him[3] Prajāpati, the year,[4] after creating creatures, burst. He put himself together by the metres Because he put himself together by means of the metres, therefore is it the Saṃhitā Of that Saṃhitā the letter *n* is the strength, the letter *s* the breath, the self He who knows the verses in the Saṃhitā and[5] the letters *n* and *s*, he knows the Saṃhitā with its breath and its strength Let him know that this is lifegiving.[6] If he is in doubt[7] whether to say it with an *n* or without an *n*, let him say it with an *n* If he is in doubt whether to say it with an *s* or without an *s*, let him say it with an *s* Hrasva Māṇḍūkeya says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Saṃhitā, and if we say the teaching[8] of

must be taken that the ichneumon is a synonym for what is very piercing the nearest approximation to this idea is the passage in Atharvaveda, VI 139 5 (cited in Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 86), which refers to the ichneumon's (m) skill in chopping up and then restoring his work

[1] A son of Harita who was dark in colour (Sāyana), cf Hiranyadant Vaida, II, 1, 5 A Kumara Harita (so, not Harita) appears in Bṛhadaranyaka Upaniṣad, II, 6 3, IV, 6 3, VI, 4, 4 Weber (*Indian Literature* p 50) reads Harita, and the lawyer is always so called (ibid, p 269) even in Apastamba Dharma Sutra I, 10, 29, 12 16 On the other hand Varttika 8 on Panini I 1, 73 recognizes Haritakata, and Panini, IV, 1, 100 Haritayana as names, where Harita appears Weber's Harita here is therefore probably wrong and Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VIII, 11, has *kṛtsnaharita*

[2] Brāhmaṇa here means secret doctrine like Upaniṣad *Iva* seems to be used to indicate the somewhat unusual sense, the Sankhayana version has *eva*, cf I 1, 2, n 3, *J R A S*, 1908, p 1193 n 1 Sayana in his commentary repeatedly has phrases like *antaryamibrāhmana*, the secret doctrine of the *antaryāmin*, see III, 2, 4, n 18, and cf the name of Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I, 4 (*puruṣavidhabrāhmaṇa*), Max Müller, *S B E*, XV, 25 and the common *tasyoktam brāhmaṇam*

[3] To his pupil or son (Ānandatīrtha and Sāyana)

[4] The reading of B, *saṃvatsaram* (see Introd, p 3) must be a correction to improve the sense But it could never have been corrupted into *saṃvatsaraḥ* Prajapati as the year is a Brahmanic commonplace (for its deeper significance, see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII xx sq), e g Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, II, 17 2, VI, 19, 7, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā I 10 8, Kauṣītaki Brahmana, VI, 15, Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 1, &c The phrase *Prajapatiḥ prajaḥ sṛṣṭvā vyasraṃsata* is frequent in Satapatha Brahmaṇa, VI-X, not in I-V, Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 268, and for a similar case cf II, 4 3, n 14 One might translate 'he is the year' Cf, however, Satapatha Brahmana, X, 1, 1, 1 and 2 The confusion of *vyasraṃsada* and °*sata* is another example of the confusion of surd and sonant so common in Sāradā MSS Cf Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of the Atharvaveda*, pp 57, 1045, J Hertel, *Tantrākhyāyika*, p xvi, Roth, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 106-111

[5] This is the literal rendering Sāyana takes it, 'Who recites the verses thinking of the *n* and *s* which accompany the Saṃhitā'

[6] To the Saṃhitā (Sayana) or perhaps to the reciter, if not to both

[7] Sāyana takes it, 'If a pupil ask his teacher' but this is unnecessary The question is, he says, whether the reflection on the Saṃhitā is to take the differences of *n* and *s* into account or not

[8] Sayana refers this to Śūravīra's doctrine, III, 1, 1 For *upa ḥ an*, cf Kauṣītaki Brāhmana, XIV, 5, Sāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I, 6, where Dr Friedlander renders 'hinreichend, genügend'.

Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Sthavira Sākalya[9] says, 'If we repeat the verses according to the Samhitā, and if we say the teaching of Māndukeya, then the letters *n* and *s* are obtained for us' Then the seers, the Kāvaseyas, knowing this,[10] say, 'To what end shall we repeat the Veda, to what end shall we sacrifice? For we sacrifice breath in speech,[11] or in breath speech For what is the beginning, that is the end' These Samhitas let no one[12] tell to one who is not a resident pupil, who has not been with the teacher for one year, and who is not himself to become a teacher Thus say the teachers[13]

[9] The sayings are identical, and apparently this is intended to denote that the doctrine received universal acceptance The passage may indicate (cf also Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, IV, 10, 3 where Śakalya is younger apparently than Mandukeya) that the Mandūkeya Śakha had its Samhita text before Śakalya produced the Pada Patha, which is quite likely

[10] This is a clear proof that the holders of the Aranyaka doctrine rejected sacrifices or recitations as means of knowledge, cf Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 5, 23 Kausitaki Upanisad, II, 5, Chandogya Upanisad, V, 11-24; Taittirīya Upanisad, II, 5, Deussen, *Phil d Upanishads*, p 63 A Tura Kavaseya *purohita* of Janamejaya occurs in Khila I, 9 6 and 10—as already noted by Colebrooke, *Essays*, I, 72, see Oldenberg *Z D M G*, XLII, 239 sq —the Aitareya Brahmana, IV, 27, VII, 39, VIII 21 For the spelling cf Scheftelowitz *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, Addenda p 190 Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 239. Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 199) uses the story of Kavasa as the son of a non Brahmin (Aitareya Brāhmana II 19) as a piece of evidence in favour of the theory of the attribution to the Ksatriyas of philosophic speculation over the origin of the doctrine of transmigration (cf. Introd pp 50, 51, Garbe, *Beitrage zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, pp 1 sq ) He argues that the Brahmins merely accepted and made these doctrines their own by adopting them along with the doctrine of the four Āśramas This all seems very doubtful That among the priests none should rise superior to the sacrificial cultus is contrary to all religious history That hermits, &c, were originally not of the priestly caste is a mere theory and not a probable one Winternitz view leads him (p 202 n 1) to adopt the improbable theory of Aranyaka as a text to be studied by Vanaprasthas for which he quotes the (late) Aruneya Upanisad (Deussen *Sech 19 Upanishads* p. 693) and Ramanuja (Thibaut, *S B E*, XLVIII 645) Cf Introd., p 16 It must always be remembered that the Brahmanas contain already in germ all the ideas which make up the fundamental doctrine of the Upanisads, even the doctrine of transmigration is presaged in the doctrine of repeated deaths in the other world It is impossible to explain why the Brahmins became so completely the bearers of the *atman* doctrine if it was not theirs *ex initio* Professor Macdonell has told me that he concurs in this view, which thus gains great weight, and see my notes *J R A S*, 1908, pp 838 868, 1142 The Kavaseyas are cited by Śankara on Śvetaśvatara Upanisad (ed Roer, p 257) as opposed to works, Weber *Ind Stud* II, 418

[11] Cf Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana I 2 2, 6

[12] Cf V, 3, 3, Weber, *Indian Literature*, p 49, n 35

[13] Mahidasa, &c. (Anandatirtha) Cf I, 1, 1, n 5, II, 3 5, n 4 Probably the plural is only *maiestatis*

# ARANYAKA IV

Āśvalāyana (Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 12, 10) gives the following account of the purpose of the Mahānāmnī verses On the fifth day of the pṛṣṭhya six day ceremony, at the midday pressing of the Soma, corresponding to the Niṣkevalya Śastra, the Udgātṛs sing sometimes the Śākvara Sāman as one of the Pṛṣṭha Stotras,[1] and then[2] use the Mahānāmnī verses as the basis of the Sāman These number nine, but for the purposes of the Sāman they are made into three, each consisting of three verses These verses are recited *adhyardhakāram*, that is, first one and a half verses are recited, then comes a pause, then the remaining one and a half, followed by the syllable *om* Then are recited the nine *purīṣa padāni*, additional verses These may either be recited simply straight on as they stand in the text, or the first five may be made into two sets of five syllables each, thus

*Eva hi eva* | *evā hi Agna 3u* | the *hi* being taken without Sandhi, the last four *purīṣapadāni* being repeated without a pause in the middle See also Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10 and comm

The Mahānāmnī verses occur in the Āraṇya Samhitā and in the Naigeya Śākhā at the end of the Pūrvārcika of the Sāmaveda, and as one of the Khilas of the Ṛgveda, see Peterson, *Second Report*, p 97, Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, pp 134–136 They are referred to in the Bṛhaddevata, VIII, 100, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, X, 6, 10, Ṛgvidhāna, IV, 25 and Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11, 12, &c From these sources, and from Baudhāyana, cited in Oldenberg, *Prolegomena* p 509, n it appears that they followed directly upon the verse *tac chaṃ yor*, which, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9, is the end of the Ṛgveda Samhita (in the Bāṣkala recension), and, according to Nārāyaṇa on Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 5, 9, is the end of the Bāṣkala recension[3] It is not, however, quite clear what this means, since *tac chaṃ yor* occurs as the last verse of two Khilas, V, 1 and 3, in Scheftelowitz's edition, viz the *saṃjñānam* and *pradhvaraṇām* Khilas, and the three Khilas, V, 1–3, the second being the *nairhastyam*, have 5+3+7=15 verses. The view of

[1] For these see especially Eggeling, *S B E*, XLI, xx sq

[2] The Śākvara is normally based on Samaveda, II 1151–1153 (Sayana and Mahidhara cited by Eggeling p xx n 1)

[3] Cf. also Oldenberg's note on Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 9 and *Ind Stud*, XV, 150.

Oldenberg, who had not[4] the evidence of the MS of the Khilas before him, was (*Prolegomena*, p 502) that the Samhita ended with the first *tac cham yor*, i e with Khila, V, 1, and Scheftelowitz (pp 11, 132) holds that this is correct Oldenberg, however, held (p 509) that the Mahanamni verses followed directly after *tac cham yor*, and (p 501) expressed the view that the following ten verses were some of them modern But of the direct evidence for the immediate sequence of the Mahānāmni verses, cited by Oldenberg, the Rgvidhana alone fully bears him out, for the Khila MS has the Mahanāmni verses after the *pradhvarānam* Khila, and this is probably the meaning of Brhaddevata, VIII, 94, as interpreted by Prof Macdonell It is an easy conjecture that the Rgvidhana, which has other coincidences with the Brhaddevata[5], followed that work, but misunderstood the word *caturtham*, which most probably must mean 'the fourth of the hymns after X, 190' This fact weakens greatly the force of Oldenberg s argument from the modern character of the last ten verses, and in point of fact it is difficult to deny that the verse *tac cham yor* is modern in appearance, and that it need not be separated in time from the last seven verses For the second *tac cham yor* being the end of the Samhita in the Baṣkala recension, we have the clear evidence of the commentator on the Caranavyuha,[6] who actually cites the verses Dr Scheftelowitz considers that the commentator is untrustworthy, and later than Sayana, but this appears very doubtful We know, he argues, that the commentator explains the eight extra hymns attributed to the Bāṣkala Śakha by the Anuvakanukramani as being seven of the Valakhilyas and the *samjñanam* hymn of fifteen verses but the number should be ten, as the *samjñanam* hymn is really composed of three hymns But it is difficult to maintain that it is impossible that the fifteen verses, despite their difference of contents, were not regarded in early days as one hymn, for several of the Rgvedic hymns are notoriously patchwork, and this applies more strongly still to later Samhitas

Much more important is the question of their antiquity Oldenberg makes the Mahānāmni verses an exception to his general view, that the Khilas are on the whole of later origin, and holds that they are coeval with the Rgveda, and were merely omitted because of some reason of ritual teaching from the ten Mandalas Dr Scheftelowitz who disputes Oldenberg s general position, and accepts Hillebrandt's theory of the purer ritual tradition, assigns the verses (p 3) to the end of the Rgvedic period Further, Oldenberg[7] has suggested

[4] He takes no notice of the new evidence in his review of Scheftelowitz *Gott gel Anz*, 1907, p 227 for which and for other valuable papers I am indebted to his kindness.

[5] Macdonell *Brhaddevata*, I, 147

[6] Oldenberg, *Prolegomena*, pp. 495, 501, 502

[7] *S.B E*, XXIX, 156.

that the verses are alluded to as the Śakvarī verses in Rgveda, VII, 33, 4, X 71, 11, and this suggestion is at least plausible They are apparently referred to as Mahanāmnis in the Atharvaveda and Yajurveda (see below) It is borne out to some extent at least by the character of the language, which shows the rare forms *ânuśamsisah stuṣe vide iśe, rñjase,* and *samnyate* The metre is also of an archaic type in so far as resolutions are frequently necessary to restore it The Khila Anukramani gives the following note *vida daśa padaś ca pañca Visvamitra Indro va Prajapatir Aindram pūrvanam anustubham purisapadany Agneyaitaisnavaindrapausnadaiv ini vairajani dvisijapañcamjav usnihau caturthi njankusarini saptami purastidbrhati navamyantye pankti* As a matter of fact as both Weber[1] and Oldenberg recognize, the verses are not preserved in their primitive form but only as modified to suit their supposed sacred character In verses 2, 5, and 8, which were apparently originally *anustubhs*, the fourth *pada* has been omitted for the insertion of a sort of refrain Verses 1, 3 and 6 are in *anustubh* Verse 4 appears to be 8+12+8+8, verse 7, 12+8+8+8, verse 9, 8+8+8+8+8 The rest is in no regular metre Oldenberg (p 33) considers that originally the metre consisted of seven and five sets of eight syllables respectively but this seems hardly borne out by the facts It should be noted that the Khila text manufactures the last four of the nine *purisapadani* into one verse ( ) and in this respect is certainly not old for the *purisapadini* cannot reasonably be held to have ever made up a verse They are referred to, however as five in the Kau itaki Brahmana XXIII 2, and connected with Prajāpati Agni, Indra Pusan and Devah, and in the Brhaddevata VIII, 102, they are connected with the same deities save that Visnu is substituted for the Devāh (so the A version, the B version omits Prajapati, while Mitra s text includes both Prajapati and the Devāh see Macdonell s note) They are also mentioned in the Pañca vimsa Brahmana XIII 4 12, where elaborate directions are given as to their selection to make up the *śak ara saman* Lātyayana Sutra, IV, 10 18 Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra X, 6 13, &c and in the Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 4, V, 7, VI, 24, Atharvaveda XI 7, 6, Vajasaneyi *Samhitā*, XXIII, 35 Kathaka Samhitā, X 10, Taittiriya Samhitā, V, 2, 11 1[2]

The verses contain several phrases reminiscent of the Rgveda perhaps borrowed from earlier hymns, at least they tend to convey an impression of second hand use *jetaram aparajitam*=RV I, 11, 2, *sá nah parsad ati*=RV, X 187, 1, *Indram dhanasya satáye* is the last *pada* of RV VIII, 3 5[d] (this I owe to Bloom

[1] *Ind Stud* XIII 68

[2] For the last four reff I am indebted to Bloomfield *Ved c Concordance* p 696[a] who gives other passages, cf also Weber, *Ind Stud*, XVII, 358, Eggeling *S B E*, XLI, xx, XLIV, 380 n 2

field, *Vedic Concordance*, p 210[b]); *sam anyéṣu bravavahai*=RV, I, 30, 6, *sakhā suśévo adrayah*=RV, I, 187, 3[1], *śaviṣṭha vajrinn r̥ñjase*=RV., I, 80, 1[c] (with *ojasa*) These last two cases seem to me strongly in favour of the later date of these verses, for *bravavahai* is not unnatural in RV, I, 30, 6 where it seems to refer to Indra and the speaker who are to agree in other battles, the previous half verse referring to a conflict, but it is distinctly awkward here where the first half verse has no reference to a fight or other occasion of association This only, however, proves that the Mahānāmnī verses are not among the earliest parts of the Rgveda

The last four *purīṣapadāni* are made out of the preceding verses, *evā́ hí śakró*, from v. 2, *vaśī hí śakró*, from v 5, *vaśā́ṅ ánu*, from v 4 The Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2, 9, shows that other *padas* of the verses were used independently in the ritual, *pracetana pracetayayāhi piba matsva* | *kratuś chanda r̥tam br̥hat sumna a dhehi no vasav ity anuṣṭup* | Ibid, 12, has. *ud yad bradhnasya viṣṭapam iti paridhanīyā* | *eva hy evarva hindra* 3 | *evā hi śakro vaśi hi śakra iti japitva* | *apah pūrvesam harivah sutanam iti yajati* | and again the *purīsapadani* in VI, 3, 26

For the question of the 'authorship' of this Āranyaka by Āśvalayana, cf. Introd, pp. 18 sq For the view that this forms a sort of Āśvalayana Samhita may be compared the fact that there is an Āpastambīya Mantrapatha, a collection of Grhya verses and formulae, to accompany the Āpastamba Grhya Sūtra So too, as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXX, 3–11) has conclusively[10] shown, the Mantra Brahmana was prepared to accompany Gobhila's Grhya Sūtra, though it is not apparently ascribed to Gobhila, just as IV is not attributed to Āśvalāyana in the Aranyaka itself Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 232) merely repeats Max Müller (*Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, pp 314 sq, 339)

O generous one, show[1] us a path, proclaim the regions, guide us, lord of many mights, wealthy one ‖ 1 ‖

With these aids of thine, wise one, make us wise, for glory and for strength, Indra For thine is strength ‖ 2 ‖

For wealth, for might, thunderer, most powerful, bearer of the bolt, thou

[10] I do not consider Winternitz (*Mantrapātha*, I, xxxi sq) to have refuted Oldenberg

[1] *vidā́* is rendered *vetsi* by Sayana, and S takes it as a Vedic form of *vida*, i.e imper of the aor of √*vid* (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 851) Possibly this is correct (cf. *vide* in ver 5), and it is from √*vid* in the sense 'find', for which see the examples in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, pp 866[b], 867[a] But it may perhaps be really *vidah* the subj of the aor of √*vid* (Whitney, § 849) or an injunctive from vi + √*dā*. The accent would then, however, probably have been *vídah*, but exceptions are not unknown The same question arises in RV, IX, 40, 3 *vidā́h sahasrínir íṣah* For the accent, *pūrvinā́m*, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 319 For *śaci*, cf Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp 58, 121, Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, II, 1, n, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p 239, n 6.

movest[1] Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt Come hither, drink, and be glad ॥ 3 ॥

Grant us wealth with good heroes Thou art[2] the lord of might according to thy will. Thou movest, most generous, bearer of the bolt, who art the most powerful of heroes ॥ 4 ॥

Most generous of givers, wise one, guide us aright Indra finds[3] all Him I praise For he has will and strength ॥ 5 ॥

*Him we summon to our aid, the conqueror, unconquered. May he convoy us[4] beyond our foes* He is strength, resolve, and mighty order ॥ 6 ॥

Indra we summon for the winning of wealth, the conqueror, unconquered May he convoy us beyond our foes May he convoy us beyond our enemies[5] ॥ 7 ॥

[1] *ṛñjase* may be regarded as the second singular pres. indic. of a sixth class root *ṛñj*, as Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 758 a) takes it here. The exact sense is doubtful. It may conceivably = 'thou art praised', but the sense 'move' is possible, if the root is akin to the Greek ὀρέγω Cf. Delbrück, *Altindisches Verbum*, p. 181, Bartholomae, *Indog Forsch.*, II, 281, Neisser, *Bezz Beitr*, XX, 59, Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI, 396, 436 ('press on, strive forward'), Pischel (*Vedische Studien* I, 109), however, compares *sarj* with ὀρέγω, and Geldner (ibid., III, 29 sq) postulates a √*ṛj* = *lubh d jlau* either transitive or intransitive He does not, unhappily, quote or explain this passage In RV, VIII, 9 17 he renders *vémi tvā Pūṣan ṛñjasé* as 'I desire to adorn thee', and possibly the form *ṛñjasé* might be an infin. = an imperative (cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 412, Neisser, *Bezz Beitr*, XX, 59; Hopkins, *A J P*, XIII, 21 sq, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 216 d) The accentuation *píbā mátsva* seems most probable, cf *tarádvir iḍ jayati kṣéti puṣyáti* in RV, VII, 32, 9 and other examples given in Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 36 sq, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 594 b Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, p 80, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p 105 *mátsva* is irregularly accented, but there are many parallels, Whitney, § 628, Macdonell, p 99 (foot)

[2] *bhuvaḥ* is according to Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, § 83 b, c, cf Delbruck, l. c., p. 144) either an injunctive of an unaugmented *a* aorist or a subjunctive of the root aorist. But in sense it may be an indicative *svadhāṁ anu* may perhaps be 'according to our will'. *rayáḥ suvīryam* is curious but the variant *rayí* is merely an easy correction Cf. *rayás poṣam*, RV, IV, 40, 4 The Taittirīya Saṃhitā, III, 1, 9 4 has *vider gaupatyam rayas poṣam suvīryaṃ saṃvatsarīṇaṃ svastim*, where the conjunction of *rayas* and *suvīryam* is different, but where *vider* supports the derivation of *vidu* from √*vid*. Cf V 1, 6, n 3

[3] *vide* must be 3rd sing like *śīe*, and may mean 'knows', cf Hopkins *J A O S*, XV, 276, n Sayana renders it as a 2nd sing For *stuse* see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 894 d, Delbruck, l c, p 181 If *stusé* is read, the accent is somewhat irregular But irregular accents in quasi subordinate clauses are numerous, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 595-598, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 43 RV, I, 189 3, III, 1, 1, with Oldenberg's notes (*S B E* XLVI, 181 223) *Z D M G.*, LX, 735 sq

[4] Sayana takes *ati parṣad* as 'let him destroy', and the last *pada* as meaning, 'the sacrifice, the metre used, the fruits of the offering, and all great' The words are clearly not in place here, and make little sense

[5] *sridhaḥ* Sayana explains as those whom we should hate, although they do not hate us The meaning is perhaps 'beyond all failures', cf *ati sridhaḥ* in this sense in RV, I, 36, 7; III, 9, 4, 10 7

Place us in thy favour, ancient one, lord of the thunder, bright one Most powerful, thy rewards are extolled For the strong god bears rule ‖ 8 ‖

Lord of man, slayer of Vrtra, this new hymn[7] I offer now to thee Among others let us two converse together. The hero who fares for the cows is a kind and guileless friend ‖ 9 ‖

Thus,[8] thus, O Agni Thus, thus, O Indra Thus, thus, O Visnu Thus thus, O Pūsan Thus, thus, O Gods For he is strong For he has strength and will, according to his will On all sides[9] come hither Show, generous one, show

[7] This is doubtful *sdnyase*, the variant of the other texts save SV, is remarkable as being accented, and does not help It looks like an obvious error or correction for *sdmnyase*, which becomes *sdnnyase* SV, Naigeya Śakhā, and then by haplography *sdnyase*, SV, Āranya Samhitā, and then *mdnyase* through the frequent mistake of *s* for *m* in Śarada MSS *mdnyase* makes no good sense, but *samnyase* also is very difficult (even if taken as Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 404) would take it in RV, V, 17, 2, as a first person) It comes apparently from √*as* Dr Scheftelowitz now agrees with this view (cf my remark in *J R A S* 1907, p 224) For *tam tam* (i e *tad*) can be read (supply *suktam* or, with *tam*, *mantram*) but *navyam* may be from √*nu*, meaning praiseworthy The dual *bravavahai* in the original context refers to the singer and Indra who are in other (contests) to be united Here it must (cf n 7 on I, 1, 2) mean something of the same sort, but *anye u* has no longer any direct antecedent SV *aryésu* is merely a facile correction like so many SV readings For the loc, *gó u*, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 122, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 81 b, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 301, 304, *A J P*, XIII, 284 *Sdnyase* as a dat hardly makes sense

[8] Sayana takes *eva* as from √*i* and *a* The sentence is practically a mere exclamation and cannot be translated The words *á yó*, &c, yield no sense as they stand Sayana renders, 'He who comes to think what is to be thought of for our weal, let him come to think what is to be thought of' The variant *ájo* is no help, though it might mean 'Come to the man who deserves favour', cf Taittiriya Samhitā, II, 1, 3, 2 For the *pluti*, *a 3 2*, see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* I, 298

[9] Cf Śankhāyana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 12, where the sentence runs *ehy eva hindropehi viśvatha vida maghavan vida iti* from which it may be legitimate to assume that *ehi* should be supplied in the *purisapadani* The last *vida* may point to *vidáh* being the form *viśvadhá* in RV means either (1) everywhere, I, 141 6, (2) always, V 8, 4

The Taittiriya Āranyaka, I, 20, has *evá hy eva* | *ev ī hy Agne* | *evá hí Vāyo* | *ev ī hindra* | *evá hi Pusan* | *evá hí devah* | when Sayana renders *eva* as *ayanaśiladitya* and *eva* as *etavyah praptavyah kamah*, and supplies *asi*, 'Thou art desires' *ketabdenadityasya sarvakamahetutva prasiddhir ucyate*. Ibid, 23, has *evá hy ev iti* | *evá hy Agna iti* | *evá hi Vāyo iti* | *evá hindreti* | *evá hi Pūsann iti* | *evá hi deva iti* | The accents are those of the Ānandaśrama text (I, 88, 89), and may be wrong In the Maitrayani Samhita, II, 3, 18 (a reference which I owe to Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, p. 305[a]) all the MSS have *evā* (or *evá*) *hy Agne* The Kausitaki Brahmana, XXIII, 2, gives two accounts of the Mahanāmnis or Śakvaris, and gives as the five *purisapadani* *evā hy eva* | *eva hy Agne* | *eva hindra* | *evā hi Pusan* | *evā hi devah* |

It is by no means obvious how these verses came to be considered as an especially fruitful rain spell As such they are clearly recognized in the Gobhila Grhya Sutra, III, 2, and the Khadira Grhya Sūtra, II, 5, 22 sq, where the Śakvarivrata is clearly a rite of sympathetic magic to produce plentiful rain (see Oldenberg, *Religion der Veda*, pp 420-422, with whose remarks I fully concur)

# ĀRAṆYAKA V

## ADHYĀYA 1.

IN the Mahāvrata ceremony there are twenty-five verses to accompany the kindling of the fire[1] In the twenty-one[2] verses (used in the Vishuvant) four are inserted before the second last, beginning, 'With fuel Agni' (RV., VIII, 44, 1) A bull is to be offered to Viśvakarman[3] accompanied by muttering the verses. The Ājya and Praüga Śastras are taken from the Viśvajit[4] The Śastras of

[1] Sāyana explains that although the Sāmidhenī verses are not part of the Soma sacrifice itself, yet they are used in the animal sacrifice which forms a part of it and so are in place here He quotes Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, III, 1, 18, 9 *anarthakyāt tad aṅgeshu*. They are to be said after the anointing of the animal by the Adhvaryu, according to Āpastamba. Cf. also his Yajñaparibhāshā, 2 and 3 (*S B E*, XXX, 319, 345) For the gen., cf. Caland, *Altindisches Zauberritual*, p. 18, n. 2, Śatapatha Brāhmana, X, 1, 5, 4, III, 1, 1, n 3

[2] There are in the Darśapūrnamāseshṭi, see Hillebrandt, *Neu und Vollmondsopfer*, pp 74 sq, fifteen verses beginning with RV, III, 27, 1 (cf Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 299, Bergaigne, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la liturgie védique*, p. 19), see Taittirīya Brahmana, III, 5, 2, 1 There are only eleven separate verses, but the first and last are each thrice repeated In the Vishuvant the fifteen are extended into twenty one by the interpolation of six verses beginning with RV, III, 27, 5 These are inserted before the second last verse, RV, V, 28, 5 Then four more verses, beginning with RV, VIII, 44 1, are added before this verse to make up the twenty-five The Śaṅkhayana here ignores these verses. Aitareya Brahmana, I 1, 14, gives the number as 17 See a list in Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, I, 2, 7 The construction acc. for nom is remarkable and is not a mark of late or careless style, for these irregularities and the use of numerals are found in the Mantras (e g *saptá ṛshnam, śatám pūrbhíḥ*, cited by Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 486 c) and in the Aitareya Brahmana, III, 48, 9 *catuḥsatam kavacana asuḥ*, while in VII, 2, 7, *parvataraḥ sastis trīṇi ca śatāny ahṛtya* occurs (see Aufrecht, p 428) Above, II 2 4, 3 8, occurs *sattriṃśatam sahasram* while Aitareya Brāhmana, VII, 1 has *sattriṃśatam ekapadiḥ* which examples all appear to be transfers of accusative for nominative, though the possibility of their being new stems in *a* cannot be denied (especially as the Aitareya Brahmana actually has *trayastriṃśatya*, a transfer to the *i* declension) Cf Introd, p. 56 The idiom has hardly been adequately noticed in Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 82

[3] The Śankhayana Āranyaka, I, 1, prescribes a bull for Indra and a goat for Prajapati The Śrauta Sutra, XVII 7, 7, mentions also a *savanīya paśu*, see Hillebrandt *Ritual Litteratur*, pp. 125, 136 Cf also Katyayana Śrauta Sutra, XIII, 2, 17 *Upāṃśu* means not in silence but so as not to be overheard, see Sayana's quotation, *karanavad aśabdam manaḥprayogam*, and Apastamba Yajñaparibhashā 9 11 and 113 (*S B E*, XXX, 319 and 345), where the Sāmidhenis are not *upāṃśu* but *antara* (see note on 11)

[4] For the Ājya see I 1, 1 The Prauga consists of seven *trcas*, I, 1, 3-4, preceded by the *puroruc*, *Vayur agrega yajñaprir*, &c, Sankhayana Śrauta Sutra, VII, 10, 9 The *puroruc* are also given in Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Ṛgveda*, as Khila, V, 6

the Hotrakas are taken from the Caturvimśa rite[5] In the morning pressing the Brāhmaṇācchaṃsin should add the verses, beginning, 'The busy moving ones' (RV, X, 153, 1) and at the midday pressing the verses, 'Of this strong youthful one drink' (RV, X, 160, 1)[6] The tristich which forms the strophe begins, 'The buffalo in the bowls, the barley-mixed' (RV, II, 22, 1), the tristich forming the antistrophe consists of the three verses, 'Indra, come hither to us from far away' (RV, I, 130, 1), 'For to Indra heaven, the wise one, bowed' (RV, X, 127, 1), and, 'To him a song excelling' (RV, X, 133, 1)[7] The Marutvatīya Śastra is taken over from the Caturvimśa and extended by the hymns, 'Fair has been my effort, singer' (RV, X, 27, 1), 'Drink the Soma for which in anger thou breakest' (RV, VI, 17, 1), 'With what splendour' (RV, I, 165, 1), and, 'Indra, with the Maruts' (RV, III, 47 1)[8] The Marutvatīya Śastra ends with the hymn, 'Thou art born, terrible, for strength, for energy' (RV, X, 53 1) At the end of the Marutvatīya Śastra, the Hotṛ, leaving his place by the incomplete route,[9] offers three oblations in the Agnīdh's fire with a ladle of *udumbara* wood (accompanying them with the verses) —

[5] The Hotrakas are the Maitravaruna, Brahmanācchaṃsin and Achāvāka In the Agniṣṭoma their Śastras begin with RV, III, 62, 16, VIII, 17, 1, III 12, 1, respectively In the Caturvimśa they begin with RV, V, 68, 3, I, 4, 1, VIII, 72, 13, respectively

[6] The Mahāvrata differs in these points even from the Caturvimśa. Sāyana leaves it undecided whether the passages extend to five verses, or only to one verse by the *paribhāṣā*, *ṛcaṃ pādagrahaṇe*, for which see Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, I, 1, 17

[7] These verses are apparently to precede the Śastra of the Brahmanācchaṃsin at the midday pressing The word *stotriya* is used because the verses correspond to those used in the Saman corresponding to the Śastra, cf Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 103 The Śāṅkhayana Śakha ignores the Śastras of the Hotrakas The reference to the midday pressing is out of order

[8] For the Marutvatīya Śastra of the Hotṛ at the midday pressing, see I, 2, 1 and 2 In the Agniṣṭoma it begins with RV, VIII, 68, 1–3, and VIII, 2, 1–3 The Caturvimśa contains alterations, and the Mahavrata adds the hymns enumerated *Ātanah* (found in VS., TS, &c) must mean *vistarah* as Sayana has it here Cf Aitareya Brahmana, V, 4 12, where Sayana renders *śastrakḷptih* Friedlander, on Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka, I, 3 suggests the sense 'scheme' for it. In RV, II, 1, 10, *ātānah* = 'expander', cf my *Śaṅkhāyana Aranyaka*, p. 3, n 6

[9] Sayana here (cf Ānartīya on Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 13, 7 VII, 7, 4, Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, V, 19, 8, VI, 5, 1, and comm) explains that the *saṃsthitasaṃcarah* is when, after the completion of the pressing, the Hotṛ departs from the *sadas* by the west, the *visaṃsthita*° is when, before the pressing is finished, he leaves by the eastern side. The Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVII, 12 gives eight oblations on the *agnidhriya* instead of three there and ten in the *marjalīya* The Mantras are quite different. See XVII, 12, 1–4 The first is a long prose Mantra, the second to the seventh *svāhā* Mantras, and the eighth consists of a couple of verses, the first an *anuṣṭubh*, the second a *gayatrī* in strongly marked iambic metre of an archaic type, neither of which verses has, according to Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*, any parallel. After reciting the verses, he puts down the ladle *yathāyatanam*, departs by the way he came, and in front of the *sadas* to the north of the *sruti*, facing the

'Indra, Bṛhaspati, Soma, and the goddess, Vāc, have aided me[10] May Mitra and Varuṇa, Heaven and Earth, aid me when first I call ‖ 1 ‖

'May the Ādityas, the all gods, and the seven anointed Kings,[11] Vāyu, Pūṣan, Varuṇa, Soma, Agni, Sūrya, with the constellations, may they help me ‖ 2 ‖

'May the fathers protect me, and all this universe, and the children of Pṛśni, the Maruts, with their splendour, ye who have Agni as your tongue and are worthy of sacrifice, may ye gods, hearing our cry, protect us ‖ 3 ‖'

He offers ten oblations on the *marjālīya* altar[12] to the south, the last of which he first divides into four and deposits to the north of the fire In the middle of the day, after the carrying forth of the fire, the *marjālīya* fire is made

east, he mutters the *parimadah japah*, *vag ayur viśvayur viśvam ayur ehy eva hi idrepehi viśvatha vida maghavan vida iti* (cf above, p. 263) after which he adores the several members of the fire altar conceived in human form (XVII, 12, 6–13 6) For the Parimads themselves, cf. my *Śaṅkhayana Aranyaka*, p. 4, Eggeling *S B E*, XLI, 288, n 2, and for the meaning of √*mad*, Lanman in Whitney's *Translation of Atharvaveda*, p 158 The Hotṛ goes north to the Agnidh's fire (For Agnidh, cf Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 189, and Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 18 n 6)

[10] Or 'may they aid me', as Sayana takes it. He thinks *purvahutau* is an epithet of *Dyavaprthivi* or *Mitravarunau*

[11] Sayana explains this by the list in Taittiriya Āranyaka I, 7, *arogo bhrajah patarah patangah | svarnaro jyotiṣiman vibhāsah | te asmai sarve divam atapanti |* This may be right, otherwise one might expect it to mean the seven Ādityas. No doubt the seven Ādityas set the model to the later theory of seven suns, whose names are variously given (cf. seven Ṛsis, seven Hotṛs, seven sounds &c., Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 225), see Visnu Purana, VI, 2, Hopkins, *Great Epic of India* p 475 Rajendralala reads in the text *mā nu*, which is certainly wrongly accented and seems not quite as likely as *manu* in view of the *anu* elsewhere used The Taittiriya Brahmana, II, 5, 8, 2 has *ánu tvendro madatv ánu Bṛhaspátih | ánu Sómo ánv Agnír avīt | ánu tvā víśve devā́ avantu | ánu saptá rā́jano yá utābhíṣiktāḥ | ánu tvā Mitrā́várunau ihā́vatam | ánu dyavapṛthivī viśvaśambhū | sū́ryo áhobhir ánu tvavatu | can drámā nákṣatrair ánu tvāvatu |* Note the different reading *utá abhíṣiktāḥ* The text appears from Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 973[a], to occur in Kāṭhaka Samhita, XXXVII, 9 d, which has (9 c) *sūryo 'hobhir anu tvavatu*, confirming *manu* against Mitra's *ma nu* (which is followed in the *Concordance*, p 1028[b]), and (9 b) *anu Somo anv Agnir avīt*, and (9 a) *anu tvendro madatv anu Brhaspatih*, thus presenting only one line as against the two lines of the Āranyaka and the Brahmana In the next verse *yé agnijihvā́ utá va yájatrah* is a tag found in RV., VI, 52, 13 c, and in the other Samhitas (Bloomfield, p. 795[b]), the other three *padas* seem as yet unparalleled The series of prose Mantras below is also (see Index II) unique.

[12] In the middle of the sadas and the *havirdhānas* there is a space from north to south The *agnidhrīya* altar is at the north, the *marjalīya* at the south. With *caturgṛhītam*, *ajyam* must be understood see Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhasa 195 (*S B E*, XXX 341) cf *caturgṛhītena juhoti*, Taittiriya Āranyaka, V, 2, *caturgṛhītās tisra ajyahutir*, Aitareya Brahmana VIII, 10, 9, °*gṛhītam* VII 25, but the construction is very awkward Throughout the terms *dakṣina* and *uttara* are ambiguous For the *sadas* the priests' tent, cf. Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 5 3 5, and Eggeling's note

to kindle.[13] (The offering is made in it) when it is covered up, and either to the east, the north, or the north-east side. (The verses used are as follows):—

'May I become unassailable like fire; may I become firmly rooted like the earth ‖ 1 ‖

'May I become unapproachable[14] like the sky; may I become unassailable like the heaven ‖ 2 ‖

'May I become without a superior like the sun; may I become renewed like the moon ‖ 3 ‖

'May I become renewed like mind; may I be multiplied like the wind[15] ‖ 4 ‖

'May I become one's own like the day[16]; and dear like night ‖ 5 ‖

'May I become born again like kine; may I become glorious[17] like a pair ‖ 6 ‖

'Mine be the flavour of water and the form of plants ‖ 7 ‖

'May I become widespreading[18] like food, and lordly like the sacrifice ‖ 8 ‖

'May I become like the Brahmin in the world, and like the Kṣatriya for prosperity ‖ 9 ‖

'When, O Agni, this assembly is gathered (RV., X, 11, 8)[19] ‖ 10 ‖'

[13] The idea seems to be that the fire is kept in from the time it is lighted on the *mārjālīya* altar but is now 'wakened' *prabhṛti* in this use is first found in the Śrauta Sutras, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 112.

[14] The attraction of *anāpyam* is curious, but is paralleled in RV., I, 65, 5: *puṣṭir ná raṇvā́ kṣitír ná pṛthvī́ girír ná bhújma* (Oldenberg, *S B E.*, XLVI, 56), and below, *mana ivapurvam, annam iva vibhu, gava iva punarbhuvah*, and in the case of the verb, RV, V, 25, 8: *dyumanto arcayo gravevocyate bṛhat*, Oldenberg, *S. B E.*, XLVI, 417 Cf also Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, VIII, 6; Weber, *Ind. Stud*, II, 221, n. For a series of words with *bhūyasam*, cf. Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa, III, 20 and 21.

[15] *yatha mana uttarottaram abhivṛddhikankṣayā prayatamanam sat tattatphalaprāptyā nūtanam rūpam pratipadyate . . . yathā vayur asādhadimāse samudratiradidese tā sajam uttarottarabhivṛddhyā sangharūpo bhavati* (Sāyana).

[16] Sāyana renders *svam* as wealth. The day gives wealth by permitting mercantile operations. Emendation to *svar* is easy but improbable. Cf. the curious *sváḥ* in RV., I, 77, 5 (Oldenberg, *S B. E.*, XLVI, 88), *yakṣam iva*, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 4, 28, Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, III, 140 Night gives rest to the weary (Sāyana), note *priyo* not *priyā*

[17] This must be the sense though the expression *marīcayaḥ*, 'glories,' is curious. Kine have offspring yearly, and pairs (e g Umā and Maheśvara, Lakṣmī and Nārāyana) are glorious (Sāyana).

[18] The reading *vibhu* is certain, but both Rājendralāla and the Ānandāśrama edition read in the commentary *vibhuh*, and Sāyana may have so read, but this is not necessary. For a converse case, cf. V, 2, 1, when Rājendralāla reads *vasu* for *vasuh*. The next Mantra offers considerable difficulty Sayana renders as the Brahmin in the world and *kṣatram rājyam gajaśvādiśriyam adhipatih*, apparently taking *śriyām* as a genitive (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 349, 351). But the parallelism of the sentence calls urgently for a locative which gives fair sense, 'in point of wealth.' The speaker desires (a) renown, (b) wealth. Only the exact force of the locative varies in the two cases.

[19] The last oblation is accompanied by a RV. verse

(In this stanza) the three words *atra*, *vibhajātha*, and *vītha* are not in accordance with the Rgveda text[20]

Standing there he worships the sun,[21] turning so as to keep his right side towards it as it turns, with these verses, omitting the cries of *svāhā*,[22] and with the verse, 'Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet Drink this butter draught. This is sweet, this is sweet.' He then instructs the maidservants,[23] who carry full pitchers, six in front, three behind, (saying), 'Walk three times from left to right round this altar and this pitcher of water, smiting your right thighs with your right hands, and saying, "Come hither, this is sweet, this is sweet"'

[20] This must mean that in the rite the RV verse is to be altered by reading in *pāda* 3 *ratnā cātra vibhajātha svadhāvah* for *ratnā ca yad vibhajāsi*, and in *pāda* 4, *bhagam no atra vasumantam vītha* for *vītāt* Sāyana adds that these alterations are improper, just as the alteration *vṛdheḥ* for *vṛdhātu* in *Bṛhaspatir no haviṣā vṛdhātu*, Taittirīya Saṃhitā, I, 1 2, 1, VI, 1, 2, 3, Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, I, 2 2, III, 6, 4. The v l is not in Bloomfield. But this is not implied in the Āraṇyaka. The verse occurs in Atharvaveda, XVIII, 1, 26, and Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, IV, 14 15, but in neither place so altered. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, pp. 43[b], 749[b]) also can merely quote Sāyana's view Perhaps the Bāṣkala Śākhā is meant. A different case occurs in IV *Indram dhānasya sātaye havāmahe* when *havāmahe* is added (as in Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 7, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 210[d]) to the first three words which are found in RV, VIII 3 5 d But the Mahanāmnī verses are not part of the RV and their occurrence is not parallel to this remarkable case

[21] This is done later in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, 5, where the words are almost identical, *atraiva tiṣṭhann ādityam upatiṣṭhate* The Mantra is quite different, see Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, 9, 10 For the following see my *Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka*, pp 76 sq

[22] The offerings are accompanied as usual by the cry *svāhā* These are omitted. For the rule, cf Apastamba Yajñaparibhāṣā 87 (*S B E*, XXX, 339)

[23] Cf Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII 14 where apparently deliberately the direction is from right to left (*apradakṣiṇam*), though the words said are alike, *hai mahā 3 idam madhu idam madhu* The dance is clearly a rain and vegetation spell, cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* III, 103 These and the other ceremonies are all mentioned in the other parallel passages, Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 10 12, IV, 1-3, Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, V, 5 6 Kaṭhaka, XXXIV, 5, Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XIII, 3, Taittirīya Saṃhitā VII, 5 9 and 10, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 2 6 7 These versions differ in many details, the most important rite which is mentioned in neither of the Rgvedic works is the struggle of an Ārya and a Śūdra for a round skin, which represents the sun (cf Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, pp 444 506, Usener, *Archiv f Religionswissenschaft*, 1904 pp 297 sq) It is noteworthy that in Lāṭyāyana, IV 3 18, where the words repeated are like those in Śāṅkhāyana the form *vadatyah* also occurs. So Drāhyāyaṇa Taittirīya Saṃhitā, VII 5, 10, has *gāyantyah* The direction there is also *pradakṣiṇam* After the eight *ājya* libations in the *agnīdhrīya* fire, according to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, I 4, come the *parimads* They are twenty five in number and are followed by seven *stotrīyas* named *aṅgirasā sāman*, *bhūtechadām sāman*, *krośa anukrośa*, *payas*, *arka*, and *arkapuṣpa* The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, X, 1, 2, 8, 9 contains a somewhat parallel version, see Eggeling, *S B E* XLIII, 288, n 2, and thus again (cf Introd., p 36) agrees with the Śāṅkhāyana against the Aitareya These *sāmans* are called *devachandasa*, Śāṅkhāyana I, 5 and are followed by *japas* Then comes an adoration of the members of the fire (see here V, 1, 2), and of the sun, and the Hotṛ declares that the 'great one has united with the great

**2.** 'When the singing of the *stotra* has been requested, then do ye cast down the water in three places, on the northern altar, on the *mārjālīya* altar, and the rest within the enclosure'[1] Having gone away so as to keep the *mārjālīya* fire on his right,[2] he stands before the sacrificial post in front of the fire, with face to the west, and worships the head of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Gāyatra which is thy head:' then, returning by the way he came,[3] with face to the north, he worships the right side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Rathantara which is thy right side.' Then passing to the west of the tail of the fire,[4] with face to the east, he worships the left side of the fire with the words, 'Honour to the Bṛhat which is thy left side.' Then on the west[5]

one', i e. Agni with Pṛthivī, 'the god with the goddess,' i. e. Vāyu with Antarikṣa, 'Brahman (neut.) with Brāhmaṇī' (see Introd , p 68, n. 1), i. e. Āditya with Dyaus. On this follows (I, 6) a Viśvāmitra legend (cf. Aitareya, II, 2, 3) to explain these identifications. For the use of *upa* + √*sthā*, cf. the famous passage in the Mahābhāṣya, I, 3, 25 (Weber, *Ind. Stud*, XIII, 480, 481), where an ape *upatiṣṭhati* to warm himself, but a man *upatiṣṭhate* in reverence.

[1] For *antarvedi*, cf. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, VII, 33, 1; *antaḥparidhi*, Bṛhaddevatā, VII, 98; Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 312 This belongs of course to the end of the preceding Khaṇḍa, and it is difficult to see why it has been separated in Sāyaṇa's text *uttare mārjālīya* means the *agnīdhrīya* fire, which was used for the same purpose.

[2] This describes the worship of the fire altar in its simplest bird shape, head, two wings, tail, and body In Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 13, the *sāmans* and the order differ, being (1) *pūrvārdha* with Gāyatra, (2) right side with Rathantara, (3) left side with Bṛhat, (4) *madhya* with Vāmadevya, (5) tail with Yajñāyajñīya Cf Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 2, 35 and 39, X, 1, 2, 8, and Eggeling's summary (based on this passage and Śāṅkhāyana), *S B. E* , XLIII, 283, n , Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 11, 3, where as here the body is placed last, but which agrees as to the *sāmans* with Śāṅkhāyana and also with Drāhyāyaṇa, and in which the sprinkling of water in three parts also occurs The Sāmans referred to will be found as follows, *gāyatram* in *trivṛt stoma*, Sāmaveda, II, 146-148 , 263-265 , 800-802 (or II, 8, 4, see *S. B. E.*, XLIII, 178) , *rathantaram* in *pañcadaśa stoma*, ibid., II, 30, 31 , *bṛhat* in *saptadaśa stoma* ibid , II, 159 160 , *rājanam* in *pañcaviṃśa stoma*, ibid , II, 833-835 , *bhadra* in *ekaviṃśa stoma*, ibid , II, 460-462 For the Sāmans cf II, 3, 4 For a drawing of the *agnikṣetra* see Weber, *Ind Stud* , XIII, 235

[3] He had gone from the *mārjālīya* in the south to the east side of the *cityāgni* and he now returns to the south *Rathantara* is unusual, but it is supported by all the MSS Lāṭyāyana and Śāṅkhāyana have *rathantraya*

[4] It is not clear why he should not go round to the north, but all that is done is to go to the end of the west or tail side, when looking east, along the left side, he utters the Mantra.

[5] *paścāt* may simply mean 'next', or, as Sāyaṇa takes it, refer to the place where the Hotṛ stands Apparently the difference between this and his former position is that he stands directly behind the tail, instead of going past it. This account of his movements corresponds on the whole with that of the ceremony of the Śatarudriya, which has analogies to the Mahāvrata (Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, IX, 1, 1, 44). In it, according to the Śatapatha, IX, 1, 2, 35 sq , the Sāmans, (1) *gāyatram*, (2) *rathantaram*, (3) *bṛhat*, (4) *vāmadevyam*, (5) *yajñāyajñīyam*, and (6) *Prajāpatihṛdaya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right wing, (3) left wing, (4) body, (5) tail, (6) heart ; according to Lāṭyāyana, I, 5, 11, which very closely follows the order of

of the fire, with face to the east, he worships the tail with the words, 'Honour to the Bhadra which is thy tail and thy support.' Then on the south of the tail he worships the body with the words, 'Honour to the Rājana which is thy body.'

3. He returns to the seat as he went[1] The swing has already been made ready.[2] Having cleansed the two posts, the ropes, and the cross beam, and having taken them by the road called *tīrtha*,[3] having gone round to the left the Agnidh's altar,[4] (having brought them within) the seat by the east door (*he places the implements*[5]) *to the left of all the altars* The planks of the swing are made of *udumbara* or of *palāśa*, or of both There should be three planks worked on both sides, or two, and a like number of sharp-pointed sticks. The

movements in this Aitareya passage, the (1) *gayatram*, (2) *rathantaram*, (3) *bṛhat*, (4) *yajñayajñiyam*, (5) *Vamadevya*, and (6) *Prajāpatehṛdaya*, correspond to (1) head, (2) right side, (3) left side, (4) tail, (5) right arm pit, and (6) left arm pit. Cf. also the elaborate ceremonial of the *parimadaḥ* at the Mahāvrata as described in Śatapatha, X, 1, 2, 9, Śaṅkhāyana Āranyaka, II, 4 (with Friedlander's note p 37), and the similar use after the beginning of the *pṛstha stotra* of the *parimadah* (*prana, apana, vratapaksau, Prajāpater hṛdaya, Vasisthasya nihava, sattrasyardhi, śloka* and *anuśloka, yama, ayus, navastobha, ṛtyasya saman*) in the worship of the parts of the altar in Tandya Brahmana, V, 4, 1–13, Laṭyayana Śrauta Sutra, III, 9, 1 sq Taittiriya Brahmana, I, 2, 6 5 In the Mahavrata Saman the parts of the bird are head, right wing, left wing, tail, and trunk only (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, xxvii) The whole conception is clearly borrowed (cf Introd, p 50) from the altar in the Agnicayana which gave origin to the mystic doctrines of the Adhvaryus (see especially Śatapatha Brahmana, VI–X), and of which the Mahavrata is an adaptation by the Hotṛs. In Vajasaneyi Samhita, XII, 4, the *trivṛt* is the head, the *gayatram* the eyes, *bṛhat* and *rathantaram* the wings, the hymn the soul, the *yajuṃṣi* the name, the metres the limbs, the *Vamadevyam* the body, the *yajñayajñiyam* the tail For the relation of *saman* and words, cf Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, XXXVIII, 439 sqq, 464 sq, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 145 sq, and see Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 180, n 2, Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 276 sq The Vamadevya is based on Samaveda, II, 32, 33, the Yajñāyajñiya on Samaveda, II, 53 54

[1] He comes back to the seat near the *marjaliya* fire, which he left to worship the *citya* altar The expression occurs several times in the Śrauta Sutra For the eight altars see Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 148, n 4 and the plan on p 475, followed by Caland and Henry, *L'Agnistoma*, Hillebrandt *Neu und Vollmondsopfer*, p 191

[2] By the Adhvaryus Cf Aitareya Brahmana, VII, 32

[3] This is the name of the passage between the *utkara* and *catvala*, Śankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 2, &c., Maitrayani Samhita, III, 8, 10 The action is rendered intelligible by a glance at the plan in Eggeling

[4] The *pari* of *parivrajya* must refer to circumambulation The meaning of the phrase is probably given by Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 11, 4 *purvaya dvaragnidhram prapadyottarenagni dhriyam dhiṣnyam paryetya*, though the *pūrvayā dvara* here is otherwise applied The idea is, he goes round the altar from right to left, probably Cf also ibid, V, 14 The sentence is so elliptical as to be unintelligible without Sayana's *pravesya* Śaṅkhayana, XVII 7, 11, is much more simple

[5] The verb must be gathered from *atyadadhati* below, strictly speaking the next sentences are parenthetical and this sentence is continuous with *dakṣinottare sthune nikhāya*

swing should be a yard in size from east to west, its cross breadth should be a yard less a hand, the points of its (planks) should be to the north, and they should be fastened together by sticks with their points east Having inserted the posts in the earth to the north and south, around the seat of the Hotr, he spreads the cross beam over them so that it is on a level with the worker's face.[6] Holes are (bored) in the corners of the planks of the swing He fastens the planks above by means of the ropes, the right one on the south, the left on the north[7] The ropes should be of *darbha* grass, and with three strands,[8] one rope to

[6] In the Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 10, 7 and 8, the height is measured by the head of the Hotr, or if he is small his outstretched arms. Ibid, 4, 6, shows that both the planks and the cross beam have the points north. For the construction with *kartuh* dependent on *asya*", cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1316 Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 113) gives many classical examples. For *abhitah* with accus, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 183 It is found in Mantra, but more often in Brahmana Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 88 For *uttarena* with accus, cf Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp 207 sq, see Liebich, *Bezz Beitr*, XI, 284 Delbruck and Gaedicke seem right in explaining the use as derived from the accus with *antar* and *antarā* Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 273, offers no explanation In V, 1, 1, we find *uttarato 'gneh*, in V, 1, 2, *daksinatah puchasya* with the more natural adnominal genitive But in V, 1, 2, *aparena* has the accus In Śankhayana Āranyaka, VII, 3, *antarena* has the gen, in the Sutra, the acc The measures are dubious, see Hopkins, *J A O S*, XXIII, 141

[7] The Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 10, 14, 15, explains that the right rope is tied to the north of the south post, the left to the south of the north post, i e inside the posts, just as in a modern swing The point of view is of course facing east, with the south on the right and north on the left

[8] The use of *triguna* and *dviguna* with different senses of *guna* is awkward, but appears clearly so meant Sayana points out that the rope as doubled would be 2½ fathoms in length of which only a yard would be used by the rope passing under the plank (above *isumatrah pran prenkhah*) There would thus be plenty of rope available for the tying, as the top was only a man's height or less Sayana takes *savyadaksine* as 'inclining to the left and right', i e the ropes should not go straight up The only obscure point in this description of the tying on of the seat of the swing to the cross beam is *pradaksinam* since it is not at first sight obvious how this applies to the act of fastening ropes It apparently must mean that after the rope has been passed under the seat of the swing the one end is rolled round the cross beam slanting to the right, the other (on the opposite side, of course *) also slanting to the right and the ends then are tied across. Provided there was sufficient friction to keep the ropes from slipping this would seem to give a substantial knot (cf *nistarkya*) If this is so, we cannot accept Sayana's theory of *savyadaksine* and must fall back either on the view that the word means merely left (hand) rope and right (hand) rope, or take the epithet

* It is very unlikely that both ends of the rope should have been brought to the same side of the cross beam In that case *pradaksinam* would be rather less than more in point Speijer (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 106, n) points out that adjective *dvandvas* are not unknown even in Sanskrit (cf his *Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 208), and (p 32, n 1) argues from Pānini, VI, 2, 38 when *ekadaśa* is given as a *dvandva* that the grammarians recognized such types He (§ 107) gives classical examples of distributive *dvandvas*

the left, one to the right, and five fathoms long, and should be folded double. Then folding (each end) thrice (to the right) round the cross beam he makes a knot on the top, which can only be untied by twisting. They support the posts so as to be steady by means of branches and brushwood.[9] The swing should be four fingers or a hand distant from the ground.[10] On the right it may be somewhat higher or level. It should be a foot from the altar.

4 When[1] the swing has been put in position, the Hotr taking a lute of *udumbara* wood, with a hundred strings, in both hands, strikes it,[2] beginning from the lower side, as one does an ordinary lute.[3] The different notes of the lute he should produce in turn by the seven metres,[4] each with four (syllables)

as applying to each rope and as meaning, 'with strands coiled from left to right.' Cf perhaps the equally obscure passage, Āpastamba Yajnaparibhasa, 60, 61 (*S B E*, XXX, 331, where Max Muller says, 'The exact process here intended is not quite clear. The ropes seem to have been made of vegetable fibres. See Katy, I 3, 15-17') If *savyadaksine* = left and right, cf for the use of the *dvandva*, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 160, who cites Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 28 *padbhyām daksinasavyābhyam*, Taittiriya Brahmana, I, 5, 10, 1 *suvarnarajatābhyam kuśibhyam*. The different order of words, *savyadaksina*, is in accordance with the usual rule as to number of syllables determining the order of the numbers of their compounds, Wackernagel, II, 1 166.

[9] Sayana explains that they fill up the holes in which are placed the feet of the posts with dust, which is not thrown in by hand but by branches and *brsis*. This, however, is quite unnecessary. Brushwood would be a much better material for strengthening the hold of a post. He defines *brsi* as *trnavalliitalapatravenudaladibhir nirmitā alpakatavisesah*. The swing was obviously shaped like this [V]

[10] The distance according to Śankhayana should be a *pradeśa*, XVII 10 13. Ibid, XVII, 1, discusses the planks, 2, the ropes and *asandī* 3, the lute, 4, the drums, 5, 6, 7, the other accessories and the preliminary steps, in great order and detail. Cf Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12

[1] There are similar passages in the Tandya Brahmana, V, 5, 4 sq, and Lātyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12, 8, IV, 1, besides in the Śankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 3, 15, 10 sq. Sayana points out that the Hotr is now seated to the west of the swing. The exact words as to the lute do not occur in Śankhayana, but it is elaborately described, XVII, 3

[2] Sāyana renders merely, 'he should hold it on his left side like a lute' But the idea is perhaps rather that he strikes one string after another, ascending in the scale, beginning from below and ascending, *uttaratah*, cf *urdhvam* below and Agnisvamin on Latyayana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 1, 4.

[3] So Sayana on RV., I, 85, 10, where he similarly explains the phrase *vanam dhamantah* used of the Maruts, cf. III 2, 5, n 1, Benfey (*Samaveda, Glossar*, p 169) takes *vana* there as flute, and Zimmer (*Altindisches Leben*, p 289) follows him. Max Muller (*Marut Hymns*, pp 120, 121) preferred to see in it merely 'voice' For *udukams*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 92, who considers *u* here an ablaut of *a*. Panini restricts its use to Ātmanepada, but Kātyayana allows Parasmaipada with a prefix as here (Liebich, *Panini*, p 84).

[4] I e he plays notes corresponding to verses composed in these metres. The four more are, Sayana says *viraj*, *dvipadi*, *atichandas*, and *chando 'ntaram*. If this last be omitted ten are got. But despite its use elsewhere, e g, Śatapatha Brahmana, X 1, 2, 8, it must surely

over, or with ten (He should say) 'I produce thee with the *gayatri* metre I produce thee with the *anustubh* metre I produce thee with the *usnih* metre I produce thee with the *brhati* metre I produce thee with the *pankti* metre. I produce thee with the *tristubh* metre I produce thee with the *jagati* metre. I produce thee with the *viraj* metre I produce thee with the *dvipada* metre I produce thee with the *atichandas* metre' Having gone through the metres according to the series of notes, he strikes the lute thrice, beginning from the foot with a branch of *udumbara* wood, fresh and still leafy, using the foot of it, (to the words) 'For up breathing I strike thee, for down-breathing I strike thee, for cross breathing I strike thee' But he should not say, 'I strike thee,' for other desires[5] Then he hands over to the Saman singers the lute with the branch[6] He places his two hands on the back plank (with the words), 'For creatures thee (I touch),' and pushes the swing to the east (with the words), 'Swing forward like the breath,' crosswise[7] (with the words), 'Swing crosswise for cross-breathing,' and back to himself (with the words) 'Swing like back breathing' He repeats the words *bhuh*, *bhuvah*, and *svar*[8] He then pushes the swing to the east[9] (with the words), 'For breath I push thee,' crosswise (with the words), 'For cross breathing I push thee,' and back to himself (with the words), 'For down-breathing I push thee' (With the words) 'May the Vasus mount thee with the *gayatri* metre, I mount after them,' he places his elbows on the back plank[10] Then he should touch the front plank with his

mean each metre has four more syllables than its predecessor, viz 24, 28, 32, &c., and so Sayana takes it on Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 6

[5] No doubt, as Sayana says a reference to a practice of other Śakhas, but not to the Śankhayana Aranyaka or Śrauta Sutra For the words *audumbarya*, &c, cf *audumbaryardrayā śakhaya sapalasaya* in Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 13 For the construction, cf the acc of whole and part, e g AV, V, 8, 9 (cited by Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 20, Delbrück *Vergl Synt* I, 385) *enam marmani vidhya* when, however, according to Whitney, *Translation of Atharvaveda* the reading should be *marmani*, loc., though *marmani* appears also in the Ajmir edition *samvat* 1957 Somewhat analogous cases appear in Speijer, § 83, Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ* p 268 Or *muladelena* may refer to the lute

[6] In Śankhayana it is the Udgatṛ who has throughout to deal with the lute

[7] Clearly the *vyana* is a breath at right angles to *prana* and *apana* This is an unusual conception of it, and is not mentioned in Deussen, *Philosophie der Upanishads*, p 251, E T, p. 279

[8] *Sayana says that the repetition of these three words denotes a desire that the three worlds* be established by the threefold moving of the swing They are used in Lāṭyāyana IV, 1, 4 in connexion with the playing of the lute Cf also Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 339 Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p 432, n, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I 163

[9] The *eva* denotes that the action is as before, only the verses being different (Sāyana)

[10] In Śankhayana, XVII, 16 he touches the swing with his breast and then alternately he puts his right and left side over with Mantras almost identical with those here save that *arka 'si* is prefixed and each ends with a dative *rajyaya* &c He then plants his two feet to the east.

hands separately,[11] like a serpent about to creep He should touch the middle plank with his chin, or if there are two[12] the point of joining of the two (With the words), 'May the Rudras mount thee with the *triṣṭubh* metre, I mount after them,' he lays his right thigh[13] (over the seat) (With the words), 'May the Ādityas mount thee with the *jagatī* metre, I mount after them,' (he lays) his left thigh (With the words), 'May the All-gods mount thee with the *anuṣṭubh* metre, I mount after them,' he mounts (the swing)[14] To the west of his own altar he places his right foot pointing to the east, and then his left[15] If the former is tired, then the latter, if the latter, then the former. But the two together must never be off the ground The Hotrakas sit down on bundles of grass, and so does the Brahman priest The Udgatr sits on a stool of *udumbara* wood. If he has to leave for any absolutely necessary action, then having set one to guard, he descends towards the east, and having carried out the exact business he

Then he sits crosswise on the swing and touches the back of it with the Mantra, *Prajāpatis tvarohatu vayuh prenkhayatu* This act is preceded and followed by three expirations and three inspirations The Mantras of the Udgatr in mounting his seat in Laṭyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III, 12 8, are like those in Śankhayana omitting *arko 'si*, but Laṭyayana, III, 12, 9, permits them to be reduced to simply *gayatrena tva chandasarohami*, &c In Laṭyayana the verses are said by the Udgatr Ibid, 10–12 Gautama adds a fifth stoma with *vairupena*, Dhanamjayya has four, and Śandilya only three

[11] The Anandaśrama edition reads *yatha hi*, which is nonsense The reading of Rājendralala is that clearly of Sayana, who takes the point of comparison to lie in the fact that he raises his hands as a snake about to creep raises its head *Nana* must be an adverb meaning 'separately It might possibly be suggested that it meant here 'without', a sense ascribed by Pānini, II, 3, 32, but even then the comparison with the snake would have little point For the use of *nānā*, cf Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVI, 7, 8, 10, XVII, 3, 8, Laṭyayana Śrauta Sūtra, III 3, 9 (=Kātyayana Śrauta Sutra, XII, 2, 8) *nana papakrtya* Āśvalayana Grhya Sutra, I 3 10 *nanāpi sati daivate*, Manava Gṛhya Sutra, II 18, and other passages in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 545[b] For a similar metaphor, cf Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 6 5 *yatha śakunir utpatiṣyan*

[12] There may be two or three, V, 1, 3 They are fastened by the *sūcis*

[13] In Śankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVII 16, 1, occurs, *dakṣinam bhagam atmano 'tikaran*, where Govinda explains by *hrdayat pṛthak kurvan*, but Sayana here talks of *prenkharohanam*, and the sense requires the meaning 'lays over', which is probably meant also in the Śankhayana passage, as pointed out by Friedlander on Śankhayana Aranyaka, I, 7 Cf Introd, p 67

[14] The same series of gods and metres occurs in the Vajasaneyi Samhita XI, 60, 65, Taittiriya Samhitā, IV, 1, 5, Maitrayani Samhita, II, 7, 6, Tandya Mahabrahmana, VII, 6, Śankhayana Aranyaka, XI, 8 Cf Śatapatha Brahmana, VI, 5, 3 (*agnicayana*) X, 4, 17, and see Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 268 and cf the Rājasūya verses, Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 6, 1–4.

[15] The exact sense of this is taken by Sayana to be that the feet are to be used alternately, and this seems correct, though it is not said exactly that the two cannot ever be both on the ground at once They must not be both off the ground cf I, 2, 4. For the gen with *paścat*, cf Aitareya Brāhmana, VIII, 10, 9 *etya grhan paścad grhasyagner upaviśyanvarabdhaya rtvig antat ih dampsena caturgrhitas ūsra ajyaduter amadrit prapadam parhat* This corrects Speijer's remark (*Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 83), followed by Delbruck, *Vergl Synt*, I, 743, that *paścāt* is not so found before the Śrauta Sūtras.

should mount again in the manner above set forth, omitting the utterance (of *bhūh, bhuvah* and *svar*)[16]

5 He instructs the Prastotr, 'In the *pañcavimśa stoma* proclaim the first *pratihāra* when either three verses remain to be said, or two and a half[1] or twelve and a half' Jatūkarnya holds that this should be done when there remain twelve and a half verses When the Prastotr has spoken, he repeats[2] (the verse), 'Thou art a bird with fair wings I shall speak forth this word, which will declare much,[3] fare far, produce much, gain much, effect more than much,

[16] Sayana takes *ajapaya vrta* as the form It may equally be *ajapaya avrta avrt* being more usual in this sense, as in Manava Grhya Sutra, II, 4, 2 9, 8, Asvilāyana Śrauta Sutra, V, 11, 4, 5 &c, cf Weber, *Ind Stud*, V, 410 If *avalyakarmine* is read the sense must be, 'If he should go for (to serve) some one who has something he must do on hand At first sight this seems easier, but if °*karmane* had been original it would hardly have been changed to *karmane* a less obvious construction, while the reverse of this process would be not unnatural If °*karmine* is read see for the formation which is rare in early texts, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 121, 122 For the dat, cf. Gaedicke, *Der Accusativ im Veda*, p 135, Delbruck, *Vergl Synt*, I, 177, 301

[1] So Sayana explains *ardhatrtiyasu* The *pratihara* is repeated five times usually before the last *pada* of the verse, cf Hillebrandt *Ritual Litteratur*, p 100 and reff For the imperative in °*tat*, signifying an action to be carried out after something else, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax* p 363, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 570, 571 The dictum of Whitney that the benedictive sense of the imperative in *tat* was not exemplified, can only be supported on a very narrow interpretation of the word 'benedictive', not merely for classical Sanskrit (where it occurs often in Jaina Kavya texts) but also for Vedic E g in RV III, 22, 2 *ágne ví patya brhatābhí rayéṣām no netā́ bhavatād ánu dyū́n* it is surely absurd to take *bhavatat* as imperative as does Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI, 288) similarly in Whitney's own example from RV *yád ūrdhvás tístha drávinehá dhattat* 'must is clearly the sense and may he himself uses in translating the example from the MBh *bhavan prasadam kurutat* Probably, therefore in denying the 'benedictive' sense, Whitney refers to that word in the narrowest sense of a blessing pronounced by some person who in the ordinary view is entitled to bless This is so far borne out by the fact that Panini, III, 1, 50 (*áśiṣi ca*) is explained by the Siddhāntakaumudi (following the Kasika Vrtti) as *aśih prayoktur dharmah | aśasituh pitrader ayam uktih* | In these cases the benedictive is regularly used in Sanskrit e g *tat kim anyad aśasmahe kevalam viraprasuya bhuyah* (Vikramorvaśi), or the king's formal *aśih*, e g *akalpantam ca bhuyat samupacitasukhah samgamo sajjananam* (Ratnavali), or the imperative (e g in the verse from the Ratnavali just cited in fact three imperatives occur), but in the early language at any rate I can find no certain example of *tat* so used But the distinction between a wish and a blessing is evanescent

[2] The Śankhayana Aranyaka I, 8, and Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 17, give the Mantras in reverse order, and omit the *ukthaviryam* For *suparno 'si garutman* see Vajasaneyi Samhita XII, 4; Śankhayana identifies this with *prana*, but see my *Śankhayana Aranyaka*, p. 77, n 6

[3] Sayana interprets these epithets very inadequately, but it is most probable that they are all genuine including *svar vadisyantim*, which has least MS authority The Ānandāśrama edition considers Sayana's text defective but most probably he regarded some of the epithets as obvious, though perhaps he had not *svar vadisyantim* Latyayana has only after *vadisyāmi bahu karisyantim bahu karisyan svar gamayisyantim svar gamayisyan mām imān yajamānan*, see IV, 2, 10 So also Drahyayana Śankhayana Āranyaka recognizes *bahu karisyantim bahor bhūyah karisyantim svar gamisyantim svar iman yajamanan vaksyantim* only which resembles

which goes to heaven, which will declare heaven, fare to heaven, produce heaven, gain heaven, carry this sacrifice to heaven, and carry the sacrificer, me, to heaven.' The word 'sacrificer' applies only to one who has been consecrated, not to one not consecrated.[4] In the case of a friend of his,[5] he should say 'carries N N to heaven', not 'will carry'. He then repeats the *ukthavīryas*,[6] and, 'Breath (is united) with speech, may I be united with speech. Eye is united with mind, may I be united with mind. Hearing is united with the self, may I be united with the self. May I have greatness, glory, good fortune, enjoyment, the *ślobha*[7] and the *stoma* verse, sound, renown, prosperity, fame, and fruition.'[8]

Latyayana's version given above. The Śrauta Sūtra, XVII, 17, 1, has *premam vacam vadisyami bahu karisyantim bahu karisyan bahor bhuyah svar gamisyantim svar gamisyan*. Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 642b) gives Latyayana and Śaṅkhayana as having *svargam*, &c., instead of *svar gam°*, &c., but that this is quite wrong may be proved, not only by its inherent improbability but also by Śaṅkhayana Āranyaka I, 8 (the Āranyaka unluckily did not come to Bloomfield's notice), where occurs *svar hy esa vag gamisyanti bhavati*; see my note *J. R. A. S.*, 1908, p. 204.

[4] i.e. not to the Hotṛ in an *ekaha* or *ahina*, but in a *sattra*. Cf. V, 3, 3, n. 1, and III, 2, 4, n. 2.

[5] This seems to be the same. If so this passage recognizes the performance for a friend against Śankhayana Āranyaka, I, 1; the case of an enemy is specially dealt with in that Āranyaka, I, 8, *namum* being said. The future is not to be used for the present is to be used to signify the immediate attainment of heaven (Sayana).

[6] The six Mantras, *ghosaya tva, ślokāya tva, śrnvate tva, upaśrnvate tvā, aśrutyai tva, aśrutaya tva*, says Sayana. Though Śaṅkhayana does not mention the *ukthaviryani* here, they are frequently alluded to in the Śrauta Sutra, VII, 9, 6, 10, 15, 19, 25, 20, 11, &c. See Sayana's list. Aśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, V, 9, 21, 10, 10, 14, 16, 15, 23, 18, 13, 20, 8, and cf. Eggeling, *S. B. E.* XXVI, 317. There is one for each of the Hotṛ's Śastras.

[7] Sayana explains as the fruits of these parts of the Saman. The omission of the verb may be compared with V, 2, 2, n. 13. In Taittirīya Āranyaka, IV, 21, is *mayi dhayi suvīryam* after a series of loc. Compare for the list, Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, V, 1, 10: *bhargam me voco bhadram me voco bhutam me vocah śriyam me voco yaśo me voco mayi bhargo mayi bhadram mayi bhutir mayi śrir mayi yaśah*. Scheftelowitz, *Zur Stammbildung in den indogermanischen Sprachen*, takes *bhargas* as equal to 'beauty', quoting RV, I, 141, 1: *bál itthā tád vápuse dhayi darśatám devásya bhárgah sáhaso yáto jáni*, III, 62, 10, AV. XIX, 37, 1, VI, 69, 2, Śatapatha Brahmana, V, 4, 5, 1, and comparing Old Slavonic *bliskati*, &c. These sentences it will be noted contain older forms of words and expressions than the ordinary Sūtra form or the mere liturgical direction; cf. Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. viii, and V, 3, 2, n. 17. So *vag devi somasya trpyatu* and *duham mahat* in V, 3, 2. A precise parallel is found in Taittirīya Aranyaka, IV, 11: *sám ahám āyusa | sám pranéna | sám várcasa | sám páyasa | sám gaupatyéna | sám rayás póṣena | vy àsau*, &c. Śaṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 17, 1, has *sam vak pranena sam aham pranena*, and *sam caksur*, &c., as in the Aitareya, but *sam śrotram*, &c., it omits.

After *stoma*, *śloka* may well be 'verse', or possibly 'hymn of praise'. Elsewhere it means, however, merely 'fame', e.g. Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad, I, 4, 7 (Kāṇva), 18 (Madhyandina), *evám kírtim ślókam vindate*, which appears to be the only Upanisadic passage with that sense (Jacob, *Concordance*, p. 940).

[8] *Bhujabhuktir or bhedo bhogyabhedena drastavyah* (Sayana).

Having called[9] (to the Adhvaryu), he mutters the word 'speech' There are three calls[10] (for the Hotr) at the beginning of the Śastra of the *nivid*, and of the concluding verse The Adhvaryus[11] make sounds On this day one[12] should give much food They cause a warrior[13] to pierce a skin They smite the earth drum and women play lutes[14] There is intercourse of creatures,[15] and a conversation between a student and a courtesan The Udgatrs sing various Samans for the Niskevalya Śastra,[16] the Hotr begins with the strophe of the Rajana Saman[17]

[9] In Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra XVII 12 5 the *anujapa* is *vag ayur viśvayur viśvam ayur ehy eva hi tvopehi viśvatha vida maghavan vidu iti* The call is *adhvaryo śoṅsavom*, Aitareya Brahmana III, 12 &c, Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVII, 17, 14 Garbe, *Ritual Litteratur*, pp 100–102 Caland and Henry, *L Agnistoma* p 232

[10] Not as in the *prakrti* also with the *anurupas* and *dhayyas* (Sayana)

[11] *Karayanti* is little if any, more than a simple verb Cf epic examples in Holtzmann on Whitney s *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 1041, 1068 Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 156 *Sanskrit Syntax* § 304 So in Pali and Prakrit Muller *Pali Grammar*, p 107 This is a preliminary to the beginning of the Śastra. Presumably the words, like those mentioned below, are intended to frighten away demons &c Cf. Cook *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 1902, p 15 Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 31, Crooke, *Northern India*, p 196, my *Śankhayana Aranyaka* p 78

[12] i e the *yajamana*

[13] The ceremony is described at greater length in Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra XVII 15 The king or his representative pierces the skin with three arrows which are not allowed to penetrate through The idea is clearly a rain spell The arrows pierce the sky and bring down the waters the sky imprisons. This idea may explain the archer in the myth of the descent of Soma though the idea appears distorted there (Bloomfield *J A O S* XVI 22 sq) For the acc and instr cf Gaedicke *Der Accusativ im Veda*, pp 275 sq Liebich *Bezz Beitr*, XI, 272 sq, Delbruck *Altindische Syntax* pp 225 226 *Vergl Synt* II 117 118 III 2, 4, n 16

[14] The drumming is performed on a raw hide stretched over a hole dug in the ground outside the *vedi* by means of the tail of the sacrificial animal Śankhayana XVII 5 There are also four or six ordinary drums used The wives used various instruments *ghatakarkarir avaghatarikah kandvinir pichora iti* ibid XVII 3 12 Another list partly the same in Latyayana, IV, 2 1 8 Cf Hillebrandt *Ved Myth* II 190 *J A O S* XXIII 309

For similar ceremonies to promote fertility, cf Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, III 80 103, Frazer *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* pp 21 sq my *Śankhayana Aranyaka* pp 82 sq

[15] Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra XVII 6 1, 2 *atha śudraryau striputhsamsau pańśakhalais sy uparikalpayanti* | *tad etat puranam utsannam na karyam* | Apastamba cited by Sayana, says *uttarasyam vedisronyam pumścalyas magadhaya ca pariśrayanti* (al *paristarpanti*) see XXI, 19 Cf Taittiriya Samhita VII, 5, 9 4 The conversation of the student and courtesan is given in Latyayana IV, 3 9–11, the *mithuna* in 17 cf Kathaka Samhita, XXXIV 5 Katyayana Śrauta Sutra XIII 3 v Schroeder *Mysterium und Mimus* pp 161 sq who overlooks the force of the plural (*caranti*) in the Kathaka, Oldenberg *Gott gel Anz* 1909 p 77 n 1, my note, *J R A S*, 1909 p 205, n 2

[16] Sayana explains that the Udgatrs sing their Samans first of all ending with the *rajanam saman* the first tristich of which serves as the commencement of the Niskevalya Śastra of the Hotr On the priests cf. Oldenberg *Religion des Veda*, pp 383 sq Weber, *Ind Stud.*, X, 141 sq 376 sq

[17] The Latyayana Śrauta Sutra, which goes into further detail mentions also as part of the

6 'That was the oldest in the worlds' (RV, X, 120),[1] 'That fame of thine, O Maghavan, through thy greatness' (RV, X, 54), 'He groweth more for strength' (RV, VI, 30), and the three verses beginning, 'Thee, manliest of men, with songs, with hymns' (RV, III, 51, 4), (are the commencement of the Śastra) Here some say[2] that one should take from the body verses the two quarter-verses, 'Join with the sweet what is sweeter than sweet' (RV, X, 120, 3c), and 'The sweet with the sweet hast thou conquered' (ibid, 3d), and replace them with the wing quarter-verses, 'O Maghavan, O Indra, the strong steeds' (RV., VII, 33 22c), and 'O Indra, grant a cow, a chariot horse' (RV, VI, 46, 2c), and put in place of the latter those other two. He thus wins the profit of a cow[3] and

ceremonies a fight between an Ārya (Vaiśya) and a Śudra for a skin which is compared with the sun and the appointment of persons to praise and criticize the acts of the priests, IV, 3, perhaps in order to avert the evil eye (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III 172), cf the abuse of the Roman triumph The first ceremony clearly shows the nature of the rite as a sun spell, which has many parallels in different parts of the world (Usener, *Archiv f Religionswissenschaft*, 1904, pp 297–313), as Agnisvamin on IV, 3 7, points out. It is discussed in Taittiriya Brāhmana, V, 2, 6, 7 For ritual αἰσχρολογία as stimulating vegetation or serving a piacular purpose, cf Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, III, 104, IV, 267, Frazer, *Golden Bough*, I², 97, Crooke *Northern India* p 193 v Schroeder *Mysterium und Mimus*, pp 309 sq

[1] See I 3 3–8 This khanda deals with the body and the *sudadohas* verse following it It corresponds to Śānkhayana Āranyaka, II, 1, and Śrautra Sutra, XVIII, 1

[2] Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVIII, 14 7, Āranyaka, II, 1, 11, omits the last two *padas* and does not replace them, but puts them before the *dvipadas* The stanza RV, VII, 33, 22c, occurs in the right the stanza RV., VI, 46, 2c, in the left wing The Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3 seems to agree with Śankhayana, though not precisely, Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII, 113, n Eggeling's explanation of the *ardharcau* in the Śatapatha as referring to RV, X, 120, 3cd, and VIII, 20 1ab, seems to overlook the fact that in the Śānkhayana the *ardharca*, X, 120, 3cd, carries with it the *ardharca* VIII, 69 2cd, making up in all *ardharcau*, they are called *tau* in Aranyaka, II 1

[3] This is practically a defining genitive Cf IV *rayah suviryam*, and contrast Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 295 Speyer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 65 Delbruck (*Altindische Syntax*, pp 153 154) gives examples of the genitive of material and origin, and see *Vergl Synt*, I, 340, 346 sq The construction *sam paksayoh palandya* is curious. The *sam* is joined with *palanaya* by Sāyana and we might compare for this infra, *upa-apile*, V, 3, 3, or *sam* might be taken with *dhatte* (cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1081) The use of the genitive[*] with *palandya* (as with *apiyas*, Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka, II, 5, 6, &c.) disentitles it to be ranked as a real infinitive cf Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 48, Whitney, *l c*, §§ 287, 982 The easy conjecture *sam*, though rather tempting, is unnecessary The conjunction of cow and horse is truly Vedic, cf Indra's hymn, RV, X, 119 1 *iti vā iti me mano gām aśvam sanuyam iti*, Atharvaveda, XII, 1, 5 *gavam asvanam*, &c, Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 57, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 346b For *ātman dhatte*, cf Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XIV, 28, 9, XV, 6, 7

[*] It is possible to think of *paksayoh* as a dative (cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 12, for the confusion of °*bhyām* and *oh* forms), but this is not essential.

a horse, and the wings are made strong to fly He intertwines these hymns with the verse *nadam va odatinam* (RV, VIII, 69, 2) joining quarter verse with quarter-verse, making them into *bṛhatī* verses, so that the quarter-verses of the *nada* hymn are second He also inserts in the first stanza the syllables of the word *puruṣa*, one in each quarter-verse, at the end, save in the case of the third quarter-verse Thus does he intertwine them We will also set (a verse forth) as an example, thus [4]—

*tad id asa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham pu*
*nadam va odatīnām* |
*yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇo ru*
*nadam yoyuvatīno 3m* ||
*sadyo jajñano ni riṇati śatrūn*
*patim vo aghnyānām* |
*anu yam viśve madanty ūmaḥ ṣo*
*dhenūnam iṣudhyaso 3m* ||

The verse should be thrice repeated[5] Should (the Udgātṛs) sing as the Rājana Sāman other verses which occur (in the hymns enumerated), then (the Hotṛ) recites them in their own[6] place, but here (at the beginning of the Śastra) he recites these verses (i e RV, X, 120 1–3) If the other verses do not occur in these hymns, he should take as many out of the hymns mentioned and recite the (other verses) in their place, but still recite these verses (RV, X, 120, 1–3) here (The verses removed) in this case are to be those before the *sudadohas* verse The Śastra always begins with the verses commencing, 'That was the

[4] The *pluti* and the *om* after the fourth *pada* are probably meant Cf Śaṅkhāyana, *ll cc*, and I, 5 1 Rajendralala and the Ānandaśrama edition are both inconsistent For the *pluti*, see Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 297–300 Both *iṣudhyaso 3m* and *yoyuvatīno 3m* present curious forms, which may be compared with the rule recognized in Panini, VI, 1, 95, that *om* with a preceding *a* vowel gives *om* and this Sandhi in its turn has early parallels (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 64) So in Manava Gṛhya Sūtra, I, 4 4 *tanom* stands, in my opinion for *tanu+om* (cf II, 7, n 1) See also Caland and Henry, *L Agniṣṭoma*, pp 112, 166, 178, 232, 237, 238, &c for examples of this Sandhi

[5] To make up twenty five verses, I 3 4, n 6, Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II 1 *evam vihṛtām prathamam triḥ śaṃsati parāciḥ uttarāḥ*

[6] Literally, 'in their place' The Udgatṛs may either adopt *tad id asa* as the beginning or *stotriya* or use other verses of the enumerated hymns, or use quite new verses, but in *all cases the Hotṛ must stick to tad id asa as a commencement, and must not follow* the strophe of the Rājana Saman The new verses are to be inserted before the *sudadohas* verse, *omitting a corresponding number of those in the ordinary version* If the verses occur in the hymns enumerated, then they are simply recited in their own original place, since the whole of the first three hymns is included in the Śastra, and the three verses, 7, 51, 4–6, count presumably as a hymn for this purpose Cf n 3 on V, 2, 1 For the construction, cf. Aitareya Brahmana, V, 7, 1 *mahānamnīṣv atra stuvate śakvareṇa sāmnā*

oldest in the worlds' (RV., X, 120, 1). The reply of the Adhvaryu is not altered.[1] (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse, beginning, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV., VIII, 69, 3).[2]

[1] The form used in the *prakṛti* is not altered as it is in the Ṣoḍaśin rite (Sāyaṇa). On the *pratigara*, see Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, X, 36, n. 3; Eggeling, *S. B. E.*, XXVI, 326; Sabbathier, *Agnistoma*, pp. 55, 56; Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p. 104, n. 45.

[2] The verses laid down in Śāṅkhāyana are, after a *tūṣṇīṃśaṃsa* of three verses, RV., X, 120, 1-3; 4-9; X, 29, 1-8; X, 55, 6-8; X, 54, 6; X, 55, 2; X, 56, 1; making 23, the first being twice repeated, and the whole interspersed with the *pādas* of the *nada* hymn. In X, 120, 3, however, the third and fourth *pādas* together with the corresponding *pādas* of the *nada* hymn are omitted, and placed before the *dvipadās* (II, 11).

After the body verses the order in Śāṅkhāyana and the Aitareya differs as shown below:—

| | Sutra, | | Āraṇyaka, |
|---|---|---|---|
| Head verses | Śāṅkhāyana, | XVIII, 2 | II, 2 |
| Neck verses (with *skandha*, cervical column, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 1, 2) | „ | „ 3 | „ 3 |
| Right side (*akṣa*, *bāhu*, *prahastaka*) | „ | „ 4 | „ 4, 5 |
| Left side (ditto)[a] | „ | „ 5 | „ 4, 5 |
| Back (*anuka*, backbone, perhaps lumbar portion in special, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, pp. 7, 8) | „ | „ 6 | „ 6 |
| *Ākhyās* | „ | „ 7-13 | „ 7-10 |
| *Vaśa* hymn | „ | „ 14 | „ 11 |
| *Dvipadās* (with *ardharcau*) | „ | „ 15 | „ 12 |
| *Atindraghna* hymn | „ | „ 16 | „ 13 |
| *Āvapana* | „ | „ 17 | „ 14 |
| *Anuṣṭubha samāmnāya* | „ | „ 18 | „ 15 |
| *Triṣṭupchata* | „ | „ 19, 20 | „ 16 |
| Neck verses | Aitareya, | V, 2, 1 | I, 4, 1 |
| Head verses | „ | „ | „ |
| Vertebrae-verses | „ | „ | „ |
| Right wing | „ | V, 2, 2 | I, 4, 2 |
| Left wing | „ | „ | „ |
| *Dvipadās* | „ | „ | „ |
| *Ākhyās* | „ | V, 2, 3-5 | I, 4, 3 |
| *Vaśa* hymn | „ | V, 2, 5 | I, 5, 1 |
| *Ūrū*, &c. | „ | V, 3, 1, 2 | I, 5, 1, 2 |

[a] It should be noted, however, that this division, which is that adopted by Dr. Friedlander, is doubtful as regards the two sides, which (Introd., p. 10) he divides into shoulder, arm, and hand. For the word *skandha* (really 'cervical column', Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1906, p. 918) occurs in the section dealing with the *graiva* verses, and the word *akṣa* (*ṛc*) or *akṣa*, both of which are used in Āraṇyaka II, 3, as regards the part rendered as 'shoulder', seems rather to denote 'collar bone'. At least, so I infer from the fact that *akṣaka* has this sense in Caraka and Suśruta (Hoernle, *J. R. A. S.*, 1907, p. 13), and *akṣa* this sense in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Possibly the reading should be *akṣam* in Āraṇyaka, *l. c.*; cf. *akṣa sthavistha* (sic) just after, and cf. I, 2, 2, n. 11, but *akṣā ṛc* is good sense. The exact divisions are probably (a) collar bone, (b) arm, (c) hand.

## Adhyāya 2

(Then come) the neck verses 'Of Indra,[1] the smiter, the powerful, the earnest, who has the world, are might and strength, great and delightful The mighty[2] overcomes

[1] These verses occur with many variants in the Atharvaveda, VI, 33 and also in the Paippalada recension, the Naigeya text of the Samaveda, I, 588 which has *ardjo yujas tujé jane vanam svàh* and has not the second two verses, and Śankhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVIII, 3, where they run *yasyedam oja arujas tujo yujo balam sahah | Indrasya rantyam brhat || ana thrstam vipanyaya nadhrsa adadharsaya | dhrsanam dhrsitam śavah || sa no dadātu tam rayim puru piśangasamdrśam | Indrah patis tuvastamo janesu ||* It should, however, be noted that *balam* is merely a conjecture of Hillebrandt s for *vanam* of all his MSS It is a probable one The AV version is unintelligible, see Whitney's *Translation* p 305 In the version given, which is purely conjectural, I have taken *arujah* as a genitive from Śankhayana (the change of *u* and *a* is easy, the accent is dubious), like *tujo* and *yujo*, presumably also genitives. Sayana as usual gives no help, he takes *arajah* as either (1) *niskevalyam sarvato rañjakam*, or (2) *jagatpala nam sarvato rañjakam* Tujo tujo is *yogo vairinam himsakah* *Vanam* is *bhaktair vana niyam* The AV has *á rdjo yújas tujé jána vánam svàh* | and *nádhrsa á dadhrsate dhrsānd dhrsitdh śávah* | *purā́ yátha vyathih śráva índrasya nádhrse śávah* The Paippalada differs greatly

[2] The translation again is purely conjectural Whitney, by reading *adhr e* (infin), *dhrsandm dhrsitám*, and *vyathí*, makes it, '(He is) not to be dared against, (his) might, dared, dares daring against (others), as, of old, his fame (was) unwavering, Indra's might (is) not to be dared against.' Taking the Aitareya text as it stands, I think we must resolve *nádharsa* as *ná á tharsa(h)* and take the word as an adjective meaning 'impetuous' I think *nadhŕsa* however, almost certainly right (cf RV, V, 8, 5), 'He is not to be dared against' The editions and Whitney with Sayana read the two words following as *á dadharsa dadhrsandm* This is quite possible, though the change in quantity is remarkable, but it seems to have escaped notice that *á dadharsad adhrsandm* is quite possible and could have the same sense while keeping the prefix *a* in both cases and restoring the metre (*á dadharsad á | dhrsanám*) and explaining the Sankhayana text If *nadhrsa* is read I would not take the participle as a neuter nom, but translate, 'He dares against the daring his might is dread' This avoids the inconvenience of the idea of might daring, and the rare use of the present participle as a finite verb The second half of the line is very obscure *Ati vyáthih* occurs also in RV, X, 86, 2 and here as there Sayana explains it as a verbal form which is quite impossible, 'When Indra caused his foe to fall' It might however mean, 'When trembling (cf Naigh, II, 23) passed from Indra, referring to the terrors which so often fell on Indra before he showed his might For a different theory as to *vyáthih* (= track), see RV, IV, 4, 3 (Oldenberg *S B E*, XLVI 331), AV, IV, 21, 3 with Whitney s note, and see Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, II 29 Geldner holds that *vyáthih* originally means 'Falschheit' and thence 'Malice, Zorn Ungnade, Ärger, Hass, Feindschaft', and so has the gen of the subject or object. So he renders RV IV, 4, 3 as, no one approaches thee when angry,' and in AV, VI 33 2 takes *purā́ yáthā vyathíh* (this is the AV accentuation as in AV, IV, 21, 3) *śráva índrasya nádhrse śávah*, as 'Like a citadel (cf *ary* and *úry*, Pischel *Vedische Studien*, I, 185) unapproachable, is the anger, the fame, the

not him who is exceeding strong His vigour is dreadful When aforetime trembling passed from him, Indra's might was dreadful May he give us that wealth, wealth of tawny hue Indra is the lord, the most mighty among men' (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse The head verses are in *gāyatrī* metre, beginning, 'The singers call aloud to Indra' (RV, I, 7, 1) If (the Udgātṛs) sing the Sāman with other verses which occur (in the service), then the two sets are to be interchanged in place [2] If the other verses are ones not occurring, or some occur and some not, (then they should be inserted in the place of verses occurring which should be taken out) The last verse of the hymn (should be recited, the insertion being made before it) and then the *sudadohas* verse Then come

strength of Indra' Unhappily he does not cite or discuss this passage, where of course *purā* cannot be made by any effort of the imagination to be a noun But accepting the sense 'wrath', then AV, VI, 33, 2 would give the sense 'As aforetime, the anger', &c, and this passage might be rendered, 'As of old (*purā yāt*) his anger is excessive' (*ati*), and on the whole this is perhaps the least unlikely version of a very difficult and probably corrupt text Cf. v Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, p 316, n 2, whose version of RV, X, 86, 2, suggests 'because of anger

For the form of the verse, cf e g Vajasaneyi Samhitā I, 8 *dhūr asi dhūrva dhurvantam dhūrva tam yo sman dhūrvati tam dhūrva yam dhurvāmaḥ*, and Winternitz, *Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 159 In the next verse the AV reads *tām* (Ppp *no*) *urum* and *turīstamas* (APr., III, 96 IV, 59) while the Ppp the comm, and one MS have *dadhatu*, and the commentary on the AV and two MSS (out of three) in Śankhayana have °*sadṛśam* One MS of Śankhayana has *purum* the others *puram* *Tavīstama* occurs in RV, I, 190, 5, II, 33, 3 For the dat inf in *e* cf. Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 970.

[2] This is Sayana's version The Anandaśrama reads *ubhayāsamstha na viparyayo* with the opposite meaning but this is less probable The apodosis to the last clause is borrowed from the indication in V, 1, 6 As the next clause shows, the insertion of the new verses is to be made before the last verse preceding the *sudadohas* verse and not directly before that verse The word *samamnatasu* refers here to verses occurring in the hymn itself The form *ubhayasamsthanaviparyayaḥ* however presents great difficulty for the use of *ubhayā* in compounds is confined to cases like °*cakra*, °*pāni* °*hasta* &c and it is hardly likely that the second member of the compound is *asamsthana* or that the fem is kept because *ṛc* is fem (Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II 1, 49 52) But, further, there is no special meaning in *samsthāna* and the conjecture *ubhayasam sthanaviparyayaḥ* is possible *Ubhayasam* (*ṛcam*) is precisely correct for two sets of three verses (cf RV, I, 26, 9, 189, 7, and regularly later, cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p. 272), and Sayana's version in no way confirms either the reading of Rājendralāla or the Anandāśrama The form would be very rare, the ordinary feminine being *ubhayī* (common in the Aitareya Brahmana) and possibly *ubhaya* is the Vedic adverb. It may be noted that R's version of the comm, *tasam arthe* (R[4] against R[1] and R[2]) alone makes sense S's *tasam madhye* being nonsense Cf Introd, p 9

The Śānkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 2, gives the head verses thus, RV, I 7, 1–3 I, 6, 7–9, I, 84 13–15, VIII, 76, 10 12, VIII, 93, 1–3, any of those used by the Sāman singers Some use I, 50, 1-9, to correspond with the Saman singers. If the latter use only I, 50, 1–3, then the reciter can take any two of the other *tṛcas* to make up the nine verses As in the Aitareya, the recitation is by half verses, and the *sūdadohas* verse occurs at the end

the vertebrae verses 'The Soma is pressed for thee, come to the sacrifice, rejoice in the carouse, rich in gifts, for wealth O Indra, thou art generous and young for us to sing[4] He can overcome his foes in slaying Vṛtras, he is skilful and a plunger We magnify our leader, Indra[5] Impetuous, bright, the leader, the dweller on the mountains, hastening towards you, Indra, shouting aloud, with his eternal steeds'[6] (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse The three sets of verses neck, head, and vertebrae, are all to be repeated with a pause at the half-verse[7]

2 The (verses of the) right wing are connected with the Rathantara Sāman[1] The Rathantara has for its strophe, 'We praise thee, O hero' (RV, VII, 32, 22), and for its antistrophe, 'Thee for the first drink' (RV., VIII, 3, 7), both being

[4] These verses contain an unusual number of rare expressions, and the uncertainty as to their accent adds to the difficulty The reading of *vijárah* is very doubtful R in the commentary, which is followed by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, S, and the MSS have *vijarah*, while Sayana perhaps read *vidurah*[*] (*vitistalokadvarani gṛnadhya asmadagre kathayitum atra hṛṣṭo bhava*) I have translated the *vijárah* (? *vijaráh*) of R's text, and taken *gṛnadhyai* as an infinitive practically equivalent to an imperative, 'Let us sing of,' cf Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, pp. 411 sq, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 982 d, Hopkins, *A J P*, XIII, 21 sq, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 216

[5] *Vigahāh*, Sayana renders as *sevitum śakyah* Cf RV, III, 3, 5, where it is an epithet of Agni The *sá no netāram* looks like an imitation of older verses, such as RV, II, 6, 5, without much regard to their construction Possibly the reading should be (cf on IV) *sám* (which would become *san* before *no*) So Maitrayanī Saṃhita IV, 12 6, has *sa daśuse kiratu bhuri vāmam*, but in Taittiriya Saṃhita, III, 3, 11 *sam*, &c *Esáḥ* may be from the root *is* (cf Max Müller's conjecture on RV, IV, 2, 4, *S B E* XLVI, 320) and meaning 'swift' S takes *sasahatur* as one word, but this makes nonsense of Sayana The form is unusual, see Whitney, *Grammar*, § 1161 d

[6] *Sámajih* (for the form, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 73, 74) apparently means the 'bringer together' *Ṛjīṣī* cannot have the sense which it normally has (see Hillebrandt, *Ved Myth*, I, 235 sq, Bloomfield, *J A O S*, XVI, 39) and which is here ascribed to it by Sāyana, *ṛjisopalakṣitasomarasavan*. In RV, III, 32, 1, it seems to mean impetuous, and cf *ṛjīṣá*, ibid, I, 32, 6 *Vam* he explains as the husband and wife engaged in the sacrifice, Rājendralala reads *vāsu* which is quite wrong though followed in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 205[*] It would of course be acc with *sámajuḥ* *Śāsvadbhir evaiḥ* possibly merely means 'as usual', or 'in his eternal courses' Cf. *évaiḥ*, 'in due way,' RV, I, 68, 4, 95, 6, *aryáh évaiḥ*, IV, 2, 12, *S B E*, XLVI 437 These verses are unparalleled in other texts

[7] This means, as Sayana and Śāṅkhayana show, that there is a pause at the end of the half-verse (and *om* at the end of the verse) The other possibilities are (1) pause at each *pāda*, with *om* at half verse (2) no pause, *om* at end. The Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra contains examples of all kinds, see I, 2 sq

[1] Cf I, 4 2

---

[*] If so it might be taken as two words and translate it 'the giver is to be praised' Cf. *vi dură grnīṣe* in RV, VI, 35, 5, and cf. Śāṅkhāyana Araṇyaka, XII, 10

*pragātha* verses These four *bṛhatīs* he turns into six [1] (Then come the hymns), 'I shall proclaim the deeds of Indra' (RV, I, 32), 'In thee since our father, Indra' (RV, VII, 18) fifteen verses only, 'Who is sharp horned, terrible like a bull' (RV, VII, 19), 'Dread is he born for strength, the mighty' (RV, VII, 20), 'Ye have uttered glorious prayers (RV, VII, 23), 'For greatness, O dread Indra with thine aid' (RV, VII, 25) five hymns, 'From far or near may Indra be with us' (RV, IV, 20) is the *sampata* hymn 'Thus in the Soma, in the carouse' (RV, I, 80, 1) is a *paṅkti* verse (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse (The verses of the) left wing are connected with the Bṛhat Saman The Bṛhat has for its strophe, For thee we hail' (RV, VI, 46 1) and for its antistrophe, Come hither to the worship' (RV, VIII, 61, 7), both being *pragatha* verses These four *bṛhatīs* he turns into six (Then come the hymns) 'Praise him who surpasses in strength' (RV, VI, 18), 'Thou art attached to the pressed Soma, Indra (RV VI, 23) three hymns, 'Thou art the only lord of riches, O lord of riches' (RV VI, 31) eight hymns, 'What' whose sacrifice has he increased?' (RV IV, 23), is the *sampata* hymn 'Indra is born for the carouse' (RV, I 81 1) is a *paṅkti* verse (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse The right wing is connected with the Rathantara Saman, and so is the *pañcadaśa stoma* [2] There are one hundred and one (verses) in it, and it is called the Vasisthaprāsaha. The left wing is connected with the Bṛhat Sāman and so is the *saptadaśa stoma* There are one hundred and two verses, and it is called the Bharadvājaprāsaha The (verses of the) tail, as being *dvipadas* are connected with the Bhadra Sāman There are nine verses from the Saṃhitā 'These worlds let us conquer' (RV, X, 157) and Come hither with thy splendour (RV, X, 172) and there are also other verses not from the Saṃhitā [4] (These are), 'Ye priests, sing forth a song to Indra who beyond all others slays the foe, that he may rejoice' [5]

[1] The two *pragāthas* give only four *bṛhatīs* The six are made up by repeating twice the fourth *pada* of RV, VII 32, 22, and reading with it the first half of RV VII, 32, 23 Then the fourth *pāda* of this second *bṛhatī* is twice repeated and with the second half of RV, VII 32, 23 makes the third *bṛhatī* By V, 1, 6, for the *pada*, RV, VII, 32, 23[c], is to be substituted RV, X, 120 3[c]

[2] The Rathantara Saman is the basis of the *pañcadaśa stoma* or hymn form The term *Vasiṣṭhaprāsāhah* is clearly the technical name of what is called elsewhere (see *St Petersburg Dict*) *Vasiṣṭhaprasāham* Similarly in the case of the *saptadaśa stoma* and cf II 2 2, n 12 for the attributions The syntax of RV, VI 31, 1, is curious see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p 106, *Vergl Synt* I 39[8], and cf in Latin Lucius, III 29 *censorem trabeate salutis* For *prāsaha*, cf *Z D M G* XLVIII 548

[4] These are given also in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra XVIII 15 where they follow *esa brahma* &c. Some are also in the Samaveda The two RV hymns have five and four verses

[5] Śāṅkhāyana has *jujo ats* See Samaveda I 446 II, 463 where are *tṛpr ya* and *yām jujōsate* For the form, see Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 810. By MS of Samaveda has *jujo at*

forth, that dost know indeed all that has been aforetime or that is now.'[11] 'O Mitra and Varuna, grant us strength and food. O Indra, make us strength abounding'[12] '(Grant) prosperity, strength, wealth, to him who seeks gain[13] Soma impels not him who keeps not vows, gain will not come near him' Then come three *dvipadas*,[14] beginning, 'This Brahman' Then comes one *dvipada*,

[11] This occurs in Samaveda, I, 450, as *vilvarya prá stobha puró va sán yádi vehá nunám*, which Benfey renders, 'Vor allem sei gepriesen nun, seist du uns ferne oder nah,' but this passive use of √*stubh* is not probable My rendering is of course very conjectural, and it supposes that *asa* is read.

[12] This verse, as far as the latter part is concerned, agrees with Samaveda I, 455, which runs *urjā́ mitró várunah pinvatéḍaḥ pī́varim ísam krnuhí na Indra* Here *pinvata* has the three deities as its subject, and its use is therefore regular But in the Āranyaka text the plural is quite irregular, cf I, 1, 2, n. 7 The text could be amended, but it is clearly original Cf the strange *abvibhah* in Jaiminiya Brahmana, III, 77, on the other hand, *uttarabhyam*=*uttarabhih* in Apastamba Gṛhya Sūtra, VI, 14, 15 (Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, 281, n) For the form *krnuhi*, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 704, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p 62, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 310 See also Oldenberg *Prolegomena*, pp 393 sq, Zubaty's articles in *Vienna Oriental Journal*, II and III, and Arnold's *Vedic Metre*, Chap VI, with whose results I regret I cannot on the whole agree (cf *J R A S*, 1906, p 718, and *Vedic Metre*, pp xiii xiv)

[13] In Samaveda, I, 441, this verse runs *idám paddm maghám rayisíne ná kā́mam avrató hinota ná spriśád rayím* (for the form cf. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1297 b), meaning 'Health, a dwelling prosperity to him who seeks wealth The man who pays no vows obtains not his desire, he wins not wealth Sayana renders *rayisáne* as *havirlakṣanasya dhanasya dhatare*, but this cannot be right. If the Aranyaka form is correct, it is presumably from √*san*, as in *gosan*, RV, IX, 2, 10 &c. It may of course also be the acc or nom neut of *rayisáni*, compare *gosánim dhíyam*, RV, VI, 53 10. The only probable construction of the text here is 'there is (or "may there be") in the seeker of wealth, prosperity', &c R has *rdyah*, which is clearly wrong as probably is *spriśád* For the omission of the verb in the Sāmaveda version, cf RV, II 6 5 Pischel, *Vedische Studien*, I 19 Geldner, ibid, 166, n 7 on V, 1, 5

[14] These verses (the accents are from the Sāmaveda) are given in Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, VI, 2 6 *etd brahmā́ yá ṛtvíya índro nā́ma śrutó gṛne* ‖ *vi śrutáyo yáthā pathā índra tvád yantu ratáyah* ‖ *tvā́m íc chavasas pate yánti gíro na saṃyátah* ‖ They occur also (with *vi śrutayo* for *vi srutayo*, and *nah* for *na* in v 3) in Śāṅkhyana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 6, 6, and (with *pathā́* for *patha*) in Sāmaveda, II, 1116 (=I, 438) 1118 (=I, 453, 1117 The first verse also occurs in Taittirīya Brāhmana, II, 4 3, 10 (*pratika* only); III, 7, 9, 5, and the *pratika* in Aitareya Brāhmana, IV, 3 See Benfey and Griffiths' translations, and for *grne*, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 719. Perhaps it may be taken as a passive, cf RV, I, 79, 12 *ádat grnita ukthyáh*, rendered as 'is praised' by Oldenberg (*S B E*, XLVI 106), and see Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* p 264* On the other hand, cf nn 6 and 12 above, where

* So also *pavate* means 'he sings' and 'he is praised' according to Oldenberg, *l c*, p 136, and Neisser, *Bezz. Beitr*, XIII, 298 I am not sure that in any case the passive sense is quite essential. The uncertainty is of course a sign of early date, cf the Middle and Passive in Latin, Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 519–521, Delbrück, *Vergl Synt*, IV, 433

'To the yokes for him' (RV VII, 34, 4),[13] the *sūdadohas* verse, the *dhāyyā* verse, 'What he won' (RV, X, 74 6), and the *sūdadohas* verse

*ā stobhati* and *prá stobha* must be active, and so here and in RV, I, 79, 12, the activity may be that of the god not of the poet In the RV passage it has just been said *ágni rákṣamsi sedhati*, and I see no reason to give a passive sense to *gṛnīte* The verses may then be rendered, 'The holy season's lord, Indra by name, famous, utters praise Let gifts approach thee, Indra, as paths the way Like songs, to thee, lord of might do men fare eagerly' It should be noted that in I, 438, the Samaveda has *gṛṇé*, but in II 1116 *gṛnīte* The accent on *gṛṇé* is quite unintelligible,[a] and can only be explained by the fact that the Taittirīya Brahmana,[b] *II cc*, has *gané* In the Aitareya only *esa brahma* (not as Aufrecht's text *esā*) is cited, a striking instance of the danger of arguments from the use of *pratīkas* only as a sign of later redaction (cf Bloomfield s proof of the posteriority of the Gopatha Brahmana to the Vaitana Sūtra, Introd, p. 26), since the argument would show that the Aitareya Brahmana was later than the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, cf also Oldenberg's remarks in *Gött gel Anz*, 1907, p 234, n 2

[13] Śankhāyana adds the verses, RV, VIII, 29 4, and VI, 17, 15, but as there are only six instead of nine new verses the total number of *dvipada* verses made up is still only twenty one The *Aitareya* adds a twenty second verse see I, 4, 2

The passages corresponding to the *pakṣas* are given in Śānkhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 4 5 thus the sides are divided into the *akṣas*, *bahus* (arms), and *prahastakas* (hand) The *akṣas* are VI, 47, 8, and a verse not from the RV, *sa sūrye janayan*, &c Then for the right *bahu*, the strophe of the *rathantara saman* repeated as a *kakubh*, then the *sudadohas* verse Then similarly the antistrophe and a *dhayya* verse Then the *rathantara pragatha* Then the hymn, RV, VI, 22, exchanging for VI, 22, 2, the verse X, 28, 2 For the left *bahu* precisely the same treatment of the *brhat saman*, but no *dhayya* and the hymn X, 28, with VI, 22, 2, as its second verse The *prahastakas* are respectively VIII, 97, 13–15 and VIII, 97, 10–12

Then comes XVIII, 6, the *caturuttarani*, viz RV, VIII, 92 19 21, VIII 12, 22–24, I, 10, 1–3, VIII, 88 3, 4 (a *pragatha*, or 3 5), by half verses, I, 80, 1–3 (*panktiśamsani*), VI, 34 1–3, and I, 83 4 6 *pacchas*, then the *sudadohas*

It is worthy of note that, just as the Aitareya refers only to the *esa brahma* verses by the *pratīka* of the first verse, so the Śankhayana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 15 4 also uses only the *pratīka* It is almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that this book XVIII (and presumably, also XVII) must be not earlier nor later than the main body of the Sutra and this will modify to some extent Hillebrandt s view, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 25 Similarly the Āranyaka may be written after the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra. Cf. my note in *J R A S*, 1907, pp 410–412

In the Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 18, 1, it is said that Viśvamitra was the seer of RV, IV, 19, 22 and 23 and that Vāmadeva *asrjata* them, *tan kṣipram samapatat*, while in IV, 30, 2, RV, IV, 20 and 21, are also declared to be *sampata* hymns *Vamadevo va imañl lokan apaśyat tan sampataiḥ samapatat* (Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Rgveda*, p 103)

---

[a] It falls under none of the exceptional cases, Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*, p. 106, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 597, 598, Weber, *Ind Stud*, XIII, 70 sq, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 21–29, Oldenberg, *Z D M G*, LX, 707–740, see my note, *J R A S*, 1908, p 202

[b] Also the Āpastamba Śrauta Sutra, VII, 2, 13, cited by Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 207[b]

3. (Then come) the eighty *gāyatrī* tristichs[1] He takes out the last three verses of the hymn, 'Great is Indra who by his might' (RV, VIII, 6). (Then come) three verses of the hymn, 'A cake for us' (RV., VIII, 78) Of the verses following, 'Indra indeed is the drinker of Soma beyond others' (RV., VIII, 2, 4), he omits the last three Of the others he omits, 'Sweet are the draughts of Soma, come hither' (ibid, 28), and puts in its place the verse, 'No other mighty one' (RV, VIII, 80, 1) (Then comes) one verse, 'Born with a hundred strengths' (RV, VIII, 77, 1) (Then comes) the remainder (of the hymn, RV, VIII, 92), 'Much invoked, much praised' (ibid, 2) He omits the last verse of the hymn, 'To him that hath renowned treasures' (RV, VIII, 93 1) (Then come the hymns), 'The deeds of the impetuous one' (RV, VIII, 32), 'Those that kindle Agni' (RV, VIII, 45) and 'For us, O Indra, rich in food' (RV, VIII, 81), and the following hymn (Then comes) the *sudadohas* verse

4 (Then come) the eighty *bṛhatī* tristichs[1] There are twenty nine verses

[1] They are—

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RV, VIII, | 6, 1-45 | = | 45 | verses |
| " | 78, 1- 3 | = | 3 | " |
| " | 2 4-39 | = | 36 | " |
| (For verse 28, RV, VIII, 80, 1, is substituted) | | | | |
| " | 77, 1 | = | 1 | " |
| " | 92, 2 33 | = | 32 | " |
| " | 93 1-33 | = | 33 | " |
| " | 32 | = | 30 | " |
| " | 45 | = | 42 | " |
| " | 81 | = | 9 | " |
| " | 82 | = | 9 | " |
| | | = | 240 | verses. |

In Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 7, the verses are RV, VIII 6, 1-45, 2, 4 27, 31-39, 45 1-42, 32, 1-30, 92 4 18, 22-33, 93 4 18, 22-33, III, 51, 10-12, VIII, 76, 10-12, 69, 4-6, VI, 45, 1-30, which gives 81 *tṛcas* and not 80 The number is reduced to 80 by the omission of one of the three *tṛcas* III, 51, 10-12, VIII, 76, 10-12, 69 4-6

[1] These are—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| RV, VIII, 1, 1-29 | = | 29 | verses. |
| " 3 1-6, 9 20 | = | 18 | " |
| " 4 1-14 | = | 14 | " |
| " 33, 1-15 | = | 15 | " |
| VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-21, 24 7 | = | 24 | " |
| (For VII, 32 10, is substituted VIII, 99, 1) | | | |
| 6 Vālakhilya hymns | = | 56 | " |
| VI, 46, 3-14 | = | 12 | " |
| III, 44 | = | 5 | " |
| III 45 | = | 5 | " |

of the hymn, 'Sing of nought else' (RV., VIII, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the twenty stanzas beginning, 'Drink the fragrant Soma' (RV, VIII, 3, 1) (Then come) fourteen stanzas beginning, 'When, Indra, forward, backward, upward' (RV, VIII, 4, 1) Then fifteen stanzas beginning, 'We with the Soma thee' (RV, VIII, 33, 1) In the hymn, 'May not thee the sacrificers' (RV., VII, 32), he omits the *dvipadā* (ibid, 3), and the *pragātha* connected with the Rathantara Sāman (ibid, 22) Further he omits the *pragātha*, 'No one Sudās' chariot' (ibid, 10), and inserts in its place the *pragātha*, 'Thee men but yesterday' (RV, VIII, 99, 1) (Then) six Vālakhilya hymns beginning, 'Him of good gifts' (RV, VIII, 49, 1) (Then) the rest (of the hymn, RV, VI, 46), beginning, 'Who active ever slays the foe' (ibid, 3) (Then) two hymns beginning, 'May this delightful one for thee' (RV, III, 44, 1) He omits the seventh and eighth stanzas of the hymn, 'Both let him hear' (RV, VIII, 61) He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'With strength him that finds treasure' (RV, VIII, 66) (Then come) eleven stanzas beginning, 'Who is king of men' (RV, VIII, 70, 1) (Then the hymns), 'Him who works wonders, enduring the onslaught' (RV, VIII, 88), 'To be invoked by us in all' (RV, VIII, 90), and nine verses of the hymn, 'The blessings thou dost bear, Indra' (RV, VIII, 97). (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| RV, VIII, 61, 1-6, 9-18 | = | 16 verses |
| " 66, 1-14 | = | 14 " |
| " 70, 1-11 | = | 11 " |
| " 88 | = | 6 " |
| " 90 | = | 6 " |
| " 97, 1-9 | = | 9 " |
| | = | 240 verses. |

Of these however, no less than 80 are *satobṛhatī* verses In Śankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 8 11, the *aśīti* is given as follows VIII, 97, 1-9, VIII, 61, 7-9, I, 36, 7, 8, VIII, 70, 7-12, = 20 *pratyakṣabṛhatīs* then VI, 46, 3-10, VII, 32, 1, 2, 4-9, VII, 32, 12-21, VII, 32, 24-27, VIII, 1, 1-4, *ma u tva puruvaso*, VIII, 3, 9-12, VIII, 3, 17-20, VIII, 4, 1-14, VIII, 61, 3-6, VIII, 61, 9-18, VIII, 66, 3-14 Hillebrandt in his index gives the references differently, but this is apparently due to a confusion between *pragathas* and stanzas. There are really 43 *pragathas* The one *ma u*, &c, is not apparently from the Saṃhitā, Hillebrandt's indices all ignore it, and it does not appear in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* Of the last six, three only are selected to make up the 40. Then come 20 more *pratyakṣabṛhatīs*, VIII, 1, 5-24 Then 20 more VIII, 2, 25-29, VIII, 33, 1-15 Then 40 *pragathas*, the three over the first 40, VIII, 70, 1-6, VIII, 88, 1, 2, VIII, 90, 1-6, VIII, 99, 1-8, VIII, 49 55 (the Vālakhilyas), omitting VIII, 53, 5, 6, 54, 3, 4 Then I, 175, 1, VI, 42, 4; III, 53, 18, VI, 47, 19, VIII, 78, 10, VIII, 89, 7, VIII, 101, 13, X, 102, 1, 3, 12, making 10 *bṛhatīs*, and III, 44, 45, making up 20 in all The whole *bārhata aśīti* consists therefore of 80 *bṛhatīs* and 80 (not 160 as Friedlander) *pragathas*, giving (80 + 80 =) 160 *bṛhatīs* and 80 *satobṛhatīs*, just as in the Aitareya Cf Śānkhāyana Araṇyaka, II, 8 and 9, for the *gayatrī* and *bārhata aśītis*.

5 (Then come) the eighty *usnih* tristichs.[1] There are the two hymns beginning, 'Indra who is the greatest drinker of the Soma' (RV., VIII, 12, 1). He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Sing forth to him' (RV., VIII, 15) (Then comes) the hymn, 'To Indra sing the *sāman*' (RV., VIII, 98) He omits the last three stanzas of the hymn, 'Let us utter, O comrades' (RV., VIII,

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| [1] There are— | RV, VIII, 12 | = 33 | stanzas. |
| | " 13 | = 33 | " |
| | " 15, 1-12 | = 12 | " |
| | " 98 | = 12 | " |
| | " 24, 1-27 | = 27 | " |
| | I, 84, 7-9 | = 3 | " |
| | V, 40, 1-3 | = 3 | " |
| | VI, 43, 1-3 | = 3 | " |
| | | = 126 | *usnih* stanzas. |
| Then *gayatri* stanzas— | RV., VIII, 14 | = 15 | stanzas. |
| | " 16 | = 12 | " |
| | " 17, 1-13 | = 13 | " |
| | III, 37, 1-10 | = 10 | " |
| | I, 4 | = 10 | " |
| | " 5 | = 10 | " |
| | " 6 | = 10 | " |
| | " 8 | = 10 | " |
| | " 9 | = 10 | " |
| | VI, 45 1-30 | = 30 | " |
| | I, 30, 13-15 | = 3 | " |
| | | = 133 | *gayatri* stanzas, or 114 *usnih* stanzas making in all 240 *usnihs*. |

According to Śankhāyana Śrauta Sūtra the verses are RV, VIII 13 1-33, VIII, 12, 1-21, 25-33, VIII, 15, 1-12, VIII, 24, 1-27, I, 84, 7-9, V, 40, 1-3, = 36 *trcas* or 108 *usnih* stanzas, XVIII, 12 Then, XVIII, 13, come RV, IV, 30, 1-6, IV, 30, 9-22, IV, 32, 1-21, I, 30, 1-15, VIII, 14, 1-15, VIII, 16, 1-12, VIII, 64, 1-12, VIII, 82, 1-9 (Hillebrandt's I, 30, 1-5, and VIII, 82, 1-7 are slips), making 104 *gāyatrī* stanzas. Then VIII, 21, 1-16, *kakubh pragāthas*, then VIII, 98, 1-12 in *usnihs* We thus get 240 stanzas, consisting of 120 (108+12) *usnihs*, 104 *gayatris*, 8 *kakubhs*, and 8 *satobrhatis* (i e VIII, 21, 1-16) The Śankhāyana Āranyaka, II, 10, points out that to get 240 *usnihs* it is necessary to take away four syllables from each of the 80 *satobrhatis*, which with 160 *brhatis* make up (V, 2, 4) the *barhati trcasiti* Then the 8 *kakubhs* give 8 *usnihs*, while the 8 *satobrhatis* yield each three, or 24 in all, sets of four syllables Adding the 80 and the 24 we have 104 sets of four syllables, which added to the *gayatris* give 104 *usnihs*, to which again must be added 120 *usnihs*, 8 *kakubhs*, and 8 *usnihs*, left after the deduction of 24 syllables from each *satobrhatī*, making a grand total of 240 *usnihs*

This complicated version, as Dr Friedlander points out, probably arises from an attempt to remedy the apparent inaccuracy of the Aitareya in permitting 80 *satobrhatis* in the *bārhatī asiti* Its success is not obvious, and that the attempt should be made may fairly be reckoned a sign of lateness

24, 1) Then three tristichs, 'Who alone bestowed' (RV, I, 84, 7), 'Come hither to what is pressed with stones' (RV, V, 40, 1), and, 'Under whose sway Śambara' (RV, VI, 43, 1) *Gāyatrī* verses become *usnih* verses by equalization Every seven *gayatrīs* make six *usnihs* (Then come) the hymn beginning, 'If, Indra, I, like thee' (RV, VIII 14, 1) and the two hymns beginning, 'The lord of men' (RV, VIII, 16, 1) He omits the last two stanzas of the second hymn He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'For the strength that slays Vrtra' (RV, III, 37) (Then come) three hymns beginning, 'The doer of fair deeds to our aid' (RV, I, 4, 1) Then two hymns beginning, 'Indra, lasting wealth' (RV, I 8, 1) He omits the last stanza of the hymn, 'Who has brought from afar' (RV, VI, 45) Then come three stanzas of the hymn beginning, 'Let splendid feasts be ours' (RV, I, 30, 13) (Then comes) the *sūdadohas* verse In the case of all these three sets of eighty tristichs, there is made a pause after the half stanza The eighty tristichs are the food, and the *vaśa* verses are the stomach (of the bird) The *vaśa* hymn begins,[2] 'Worthy of thee, O wealthy one' (RV, VIII, 46, 1), and ends 'Gainer, gainer of good' (ibid, 20) The verse, 'Giving wealth' (ibid, 15) is a *dvipada*, and, 'Now then' (ibid) an *ekapada* It ends with the verse, 'Of that milk yielder' (RV, VIII, 69, 3) (Then comes) the *sūdadohas verse*

[2] Cf I, 5 1 The explanation of the number 21 stanzas given by Sayana there and here is that the passage ends with verse 20 and the *sudadohas* verse makes up the 21 This view may be supported by the fact that the *sudadohas* verse is here set out with its *pratika* It is most probable that we should understand that the 21 stanzas are made up by the inclusion of the *sudadohas* verse and then that there follows again that verse in its usual capacity of separating the different parts of the whole Sayana does not clearly appear thus to have taken it, but it seems most probably so, and the translation is based on this view

Śankhayana in Aranyaka, II 11, and Śrauta Sutra XVIII, 14, takes the whole hymn, VIII 46, as being used The priority of the Aitareya is evident as vv 21 24 contain a *dānastuti* of Prthuśravas The same remark applies to the Śatapatha Brahmana, see Eggeling, *S B E*, XLII, 112

*It is worthy of note that an annotator in S*[2] considers that Sāyana s *explanation of the* number 21 is inconsistent (this is not the case) and inaccurate He argues that the 21 stanzas are made up by splitting ver 15 into an *ekapadā* and a *dvipadā* This view is at first sight plausible but the mention here of these divisions is more probably due to an explanation of *yathopapadam* in I 5, 1, and so Sayana there takes it. The other view is, however, accepted by Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, 112 n 2, who points out that the version of the Mahadnktha contained in MS Ind Off 1729 D gives ver 15 as an *ekapada* and a *dvipada*, which certainly tells against Sayana.

For *gayatris* and *usnihs*, cf Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya, XVI 10 sq , for *sampada*, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XV, 10, 5

### Adhyāya 3.

(Then come) the thigh (verses)[1] In the hymn, 'O Indra and Agni, ye two' (RV, VIII, 40), (he recites) the half-stanzas as *gāyatrīs*,[2] but the second half of the second as an *anuṣṭubh*, up to the last stanza The hymn, 'To thee, the mighty, the intoxicated one' (RV., X, 50), has *nivids* inserted. Between the two hymns, 'Who in the forest as it were has been set down' (RV., X, 29), and 'Who first is born, the wise one' (RV, II, 12), are[3] inserted the hymn, 'Come hither standing on thy chariot-seat' (RV, III, 43), and the stanza, 'Wandering alone in the midst of many' (RV, X, 55, 5) As many decades[4] of verses in *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* addressed to Indra as they insert, after transforming them into *bṛhatīs*, so many years may a man be fain to live beyond the normal life, at the rate of ten verses for a year[5]; or he need not do so (Then come) the

[1] Cf I, 5, 1 The verses are RV, VIII, 40, 1-10, X, 50, 1-7, X, 29, 1-18; III, 43, 1-8; X, 55 5, II, 12, 1-15, X, 178, 1-3, an *ekapada*, I, 11, 1-8; VII, 23, 1-6; VII, 24, 1-4, 6 5

In Śaṅkhāyana the *vaśa* hymn is followed, XVIII, 15, by the *dvipadas*, I, 2, 2, above; then comes the *Aindrāgna sukta*, VIII, 40 Then the *āvapana*, RV, X, 167, 1, II, 21, 1-6; I, 84 10 12, VII, 31, 10-12, VI, 46, 1-3 Then the *anuṣṭubha samamnaya*, RV, I, 10, 4-12, I, 11, 1-8, I, 84 1-6, I, 72, 2-5, I, 176, 1-5, V, 35, 1-7, V, 38, 1, 2, V, 39, 1-4; VI, 44 1-6, VIII 34, 1-15, VIII, 63, 4 6, VIII 89, 5, 6, VIII, 95, X, 152 Then the *triṣṭupchala*, RV, I, 32, VI, 25, II, 12, II, 14 III, 43, III, 46, III, 51, 4-6, IV, 16; VII, 24, VII, 23, VIII, 69, 13-15 See Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 16-20, Āraṇyaka, II, 12-16 These confused masses of verses show distinctly the later character of the Śaṅkhāyana ritual See also Śatapatha Brahmana, VIII, 6, 2, 3 where RV, X, 50, is called the spine, IX, 1, 1, 44, 3 3, 19 in the last passage the *vaśa* is given as 35 in Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 223), which must be an error as there are only 33 verses cf. Introd, p. 36

[2] The second verse is a *dvipadā* in *śakvarī* The first three feet make up a *gāyatrī*, that is, they are recited with a pause after the second foot and *om* after the third The second four feet are recited as an *anuṣṭubh*, with a pause after the second and *om* after the fourth The last is a *triṣṭubh*, and it is recited by *pādas*, that is, a pause after the first foot and *om* after the second. The remaining ten verses are in *mahāpaṅktis*, and therefore are each divided into two *gāyatrīs* for recitation It is characteristic of the deliberate differences between Aitareya and Śāṅkhāyana that the latter, XVIII, 16, divides ver 2 into an *anuṣṭubh* and a *gāyatrī*, not *vice versa*.

[3] That is, if one desires life (Sāyana) See n 5 For X, 55, 5, cf Ludwig, *Ṛgveda*, III, 186, Hillebrandt, *Ved Myth*, I, 465

[4] Cf I, 5, 2, n 6 Sāyana here renders *daśati* as verses produced in the Saṃhitā, which is a collection of ten Mandalas. But the *daśato* below certainly suggests that it means decades as probably in I, 5, 2

[5] This must be the meaning, and so Sāyana takes it He, however, takes *na vā* as meaning that each *bṛhatī* produces a year of life, contradicting the ten *bṛhatī* rule This is not impossible, in which event he points out the insertion of the nine *triṣṭubh* verses gives eleven *bṛhatīs* or eleven years' longer life But it is not natural, and it ignores *triṣṭubjagatīnām*, there being no *jagatīs* in the nine verses, and therefore in accordance with the ordinary use

hymn, 'That steed impelled by the gods' (RV, X, 178), and the *ekapada*,[6] 'Indra rules all' (Then comes) the *anustubh* hymn, 'All songs have caused Indra to grow' (RV, I, 11) Having recited the first half stanza of the first stanza of this hymn, he combines[7] the first half-stanza of the second stanza with the second half-stanza (of the first stanza) (joining) quarter-stanza with quarter-stanza so as to make *anustubhs* Up to the last stanza he combines every succeeding half stanza with the preceding The rest are done in the usual way. (There are) six verses beginning, 'Drink, Indra, the Soma, let it gladden thee' (RV, VII, 23, 1) Having recited four verses of the hymn, 'Thy place, O Indra, is made on thy seat' (RV., VII, 24), and then joining[8] the last stanza, he ends with the second last stanza The Sastra finished,[9] he mutters the *ukthasampad* In the place of the *ukthavirya* the *ukthadoha* is used

2. 'Thou art the head of the world,[1] the essence of speech, the fire of breath,

of *na ta* in Āśvalayana (e g Śrauta Sutra, VI, 5 22), Śaunaka's pupil,[a] I take it to mean that, unless one is *ayuskama* one need not insert the verses Cf Sayana s note *yady ayuskamah syat tadanım prakşipet*, whence it appears that he did not regard the *avapana* as essential He may be combining two differing previous comments. The idea is curiously inverted

[6] Not in the Ṛgveda See Samaveda I 456, Vajasaneyi Samhitā XXXVI 8, Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VIII, 2, 21, Sāmavidhana Brahmana, II, 6, 7, which all have *viśvasya rajati*

[7] See I 5, 2, n 12 Śankhayana XVIII 20, applies the same combination to the *udubrahmiya* hymn RV, VII, 23 The first and last half stanzas in both cases are left unaltered The other sets of four *padas* are treated as *anustubhs*

[8] For a formal definition of *santata* see Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, I, 2 10

[9] In the Agnistoma the *prakrti* the Niskevalya Śastra Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 339 n, ends with a Mantra *uktham vacindrayopasrnvate tva* Āśvalayana Śrauta Sutra, V, 15 23 of which *uktham vacindraya* forms the *ukthasampad*, and the rest the *ukthavirya* The Hotr here recites the *sampad* but in the place of the *ukthavirya* come the *ukthadoha* i e the verses set out in V 3 2 For the *ukthavirya* cf V, 1 5, n 6 Haug, *Aitareya Brahmana*, p 177 Eggeling *l c*, 327, n Caland and Henry, *L Agnistoma*, p 233 Sayana ascribes the verses and formulae to a *śakhantara* as usual

[1] The rendering of these verses is very doubtful and I have mainly followed Sayana The difficulty is increased by the fact that E has here no accents, and Rājendralala has apparently followed a most corrupt MS or has scattered accents at random They do not occur in Śankhayana Both Rajendralala and the Anandāśrama edition print the verses with stops only at *sárvam vyóma pinvati* and *duhanam* (and in the former case also at *asi*), as if they were prose They seem clearly, however to be intended as verses and I have divided them into *jagatis* with mixed *tristubhs* *Indrah* may belong to the first verse, and other divisions are no doubt possible but the original metrical form of e g *rtám satyám vijigyanám vi ácanam* is certain For similar cases of verse treated as prose cf Aitareya Brahmana, VIII, 25, 3 and 27 2 and 3 where *ślokas* appear in prose form In VIII, 27, 3 *bhavati* is two syllables only

[a] The Brhaddevata IV, 139, in the 'B recension mentions Āśvalayana, and though this may point to the verse being late, it may also be quite correct, since a pupil of Śaunaka appears to have been the author of the Bṛhaddevatā, cf Macdonell I xxiv and Āśvalāyana was evidently one of his oldest pupils

the abode of mind, the entrance of the eye, the source of the ear, the resting place of the heart, thou art all (Thou art) Indra, the undying sacrifice, the ambrosia, the sky, right, truth, conquest, decision, the end of speech, the pervading, that which is beyond all, the light, the udder, the unanswerable, that which was before Thou art all,[2] speech, the water with the lightning that goes thither and returns,[3]

as elsewhere A striking example of verse disguised as prose is the inscription on the Piprahva *stupa*, see Fleet, *J R A S*, 1907, pp 111 sq, following, with minor differences, Thomas, *J R A S*, 1906, pp 462 sq In the Aitareya, *II* 11, we have —

> *Ksatrena ksatram jayati balena balam aśnute |*
> *yasyaivam vidvan brāhmano rastragopah purohitah ||*
> *tasmai vīśah samjanate sanmukha ekamanasah |*
> *yasyaivam vidvan brahmano rastragopah purohitah || 25 || || 2 ||*
> *tasya raja mitram bhavati (2 syll) dvisantam apabadhate |*
> *yasyaivam vidvan brāhmano rā tragopah purohitah |*
> *tasmai viśah*, &c, as above,

and in other places fragments of verse appear, as is only natural since gnomic sayings like them tend in all languages to become verse The old character of these Ślokas appears from their metrical form, and they may be compared with the verse cited from Śatapatha Brahmaṇa, XI, 5, 4, 3, by Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXX xix) Similar verses composed at later dates are found in the characteristic late metre in the Gṛhya Sūtras, quite freely (Oldenberg, *l c*, xxxv–xxxvii), one being attributed (Aśvalayana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16) to Śaunaka and Ślokas are recognized in the lists of compositions, e g Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, II, 4, 10, IV, 1, 2, see Sieg, *Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda*, pp 7 sq

[2] Sāyana has *yasya yasya vastuno yad yat purvam karanam rupam tat sarvam rūpam*, and he explains *pārag arvāg* as *uttamadhamarupā vāc*

[3] *Sāpru* is so explained by Sayana, and *pārag* and *arvāg* probably go with *salilam* In the Jaiminiya Upanisad Brahmana, I, 9, 10, this passage from *Indrah* … *amrtam duhanam* appears, but in a different connexion and in an inferior perhaps secondary, form, which looks as if it were borrowed from the Āranyaka. The parallelism has escaped not only Oertel but also Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*) Quite irrelevantly appear the words (the *gayatri* as *brahman* is the subject of discourse) *tasyaitani namanindrah karmāksitir amrtam vyomānto vacah | bahur bhuyas sarvam sarvasmad uttaram jyotih | rtam satyam vijñānam vivacanam aprati vacyam | purvam sarvam sarvā vāk | sarvam idam api dhenuh pinvate parag arvak || 9 || sā prthaksalilam kāmadughaksiti prānasamhitam caksuśśrotram vakprabhutam manasa vyaptam hrdyāgram brahmanabhaktam annaśubham varsapavitram gobhagam prthivyuparam tapastanu varunaparivaranam Indraśresṭham sahasraksaram ayutadhāram amrtam duhana sarvan imanl lokan abhiviksaratiti |* Oertel renders, 'These are its names Indra, action, imperishableness, the immortal, end of the firmament of speech, the manifold, the numerous, the all, the light higher than the all, righteousness, truth distinction decision which is not to be contradicted, the ancient all, all speech This all also, [like] a cow, fattens hitherward, thitherward She *that milks immortality possessing individual oceans (?)*, possessing wish granting imperishableness, connected with breath possessing sight and hearing, superior by speech, permeated by the mind, having the heart as its point, apportioned to the Brahmans, pleasant through food, having the rain as means of purification (?) cow-protecting higher than the earth, having penance as a body, having Varuna as an enclosure, having Indra as leader, possessing a thousand syllables, possessing ten thousand streams, *flows in all* directions unto all these worlds' It

which yields milk and fattens[4] (Thou art) the eye, the ear, breath, that which is

should be noted that the MSS read *vijighanam*, a clear error for *vijigyanam*, properly a perf part. middle of √ji (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 809), a word elsewhere unknown but of interesting function (for *g*, cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I 146), which is rendered very probable by the metre; *apratitacyah* (C), *sa caksu rotram*, *hrdayegram*, *brahmanabhra kiram* (a), °*bhratram* (B), °*bhrtram* (C), *Varunaparyalanam*, *duhanah* These readings confirm the *brahmanabhartrkam* of the Āranyaka text *Hrdayegram* is no doubt a possible and an easy conjecture, but Sayana already had *hrdayegram*, and its appearance here certainly shows that the tradition hardened to *hrdayogram* at a very early date *Annalubham* is tempting, but uncertain as Sayana read *dnnalubhe* Cf Śatapatha Brahmana, IX, 5, 1, 12, *satyanrte vacam* for Mantrayaniya Samhita, III, 7, 3, *satyanrtam* So in Atharvaveda XIV, 1, 11, *srotre* replaces RV, X, 85, 11, *srotram* quite wrongly (cf Whitney, *Translation*, p 742) I consider therefore that (especially in view of the accent) it is very likely that *dnnalubham* should be replaced For *hrdayogram* if it really is = *hrdayagram* might be compared Maitrāyanī Upanisad, VI, 35, *dvidharmondham* for °*andham* (Max Muller, *S B E*, XV, li) But error of text is easy *Vyomanto vacah* must, I think, be divided into *vyoma* and *dnto vācáh* The sense ascribed to *Indrasrestham* is possible, and *Indrajyestham* may mean (as in RV, AV, and TS) 'having Indra as its best' *Varunaparyalanam* may perhaps be right, but it is far from certain, and Sayana had *varunatayastamam*, a more recondite form (see n 12 on II, 4 3) than that of the Brahmana The words *bahur bhuyas* should be *bahor bhuyah* This example answers the query of Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax* § 122, n 2, as to whether the idiom 'susser als suss' is Vedic as well as classic (his *Sanskrit Syntax*, § 251 3) The same phrase is found in V, 1, 5 in a Mantra passage, and in the parallel passage, Śāṅkhāyana Āranyaka I, 8 Cf also such phrases as *bahu ca me bhuyas ca me*, Taittirīya Samhitā IV, 7 4, 1, *J R A S*, 1909

The accents of the R edition are very incorrect *Vivdcanám* is quite impossible In the case of the compounds R has *hrdayogrâm*, *brahmanábhartrkâm vársapavitram vākprabhútam*, *prthivyupáram*, *tápastánu*, *Indrajyéstham ayutáksáram*, *bráhmavárcasam*. *Varsápavitram* is supported by *varsánirnij* (RV), and *varsámedas* (AV, °*medhas*, AV Paipp), *sahásradharam* by the RV, *ayutaksaram* by analogy with *sahásradharam*, &c, *tápastanu* and *brahmanábhartrkam* depend on analogy *Indrajyestham* has abundant authority *gólhagam* may be compared with *gómagha* (RV), but cf *gobhdj* (RV) *Vākprabhulam* and *satyásammitam* are supported by usage (Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar* p 96 Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, II, 1, 227 sq), and *hrdayogram* is probable (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1287 a, gives several examples of different accents, Wackernagel, pp 238 sq, decides for accent on the first member as usual in determinatives with adjectives at the end (for examples, cf p 233) On this analogy, *prthivyuparam* may be right or possibly we should read *prthivy uparam* as two words, but the gender of *uparam* would be strange if it is a noun (meaning either 'lower Soma stone' (RV, AV, but cf *Ind Stud* I, 108 sq), or 'lower part of sacrificial post' (VS.)), since there it is always masc (cf n. 5) The accent on *ā druna*° must remain doubtful, but if it is a case of a past part, the accent should be on the first None of these words have found their way into Wackernagel's lists

For similar cases of double accent in MSS, cf Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, pp 39, 49 (from B). Wackernagel, p 40, points out that in cases of compounds the Atharvaveda, XIX and XX, Śatapatha Brāhmana, Taittirīya Āranyaka and Maitrāyanī Upanisad (he ignores this work) are very badly accented. His theory of accent (pp 40 sq) lays stress on the fact that determinatives (save those with verbal second parts—other than forms in *ta*, *ti*) originally had the accent on the first part and only later on the second The accents here must depend to some extent on (*a*) the validity of the theory, (*b*) the view as to the age of the Āranyaka.

[4] *Pinvate* as it stands spoils the construction, but may be right. Possibly it was originally

measured by truth, which is produced by speech, and proceeds from the mind, what is truth in the heart, and borne by Brahmins (Thou art) food and prosperity, purified by the rains, rich in cows, that beyond the earth,[5] to which Varuna and Vāyu most resort, that which has for its body penance,[6] has Indra as its mightiest which milks ambrosia, with a thousand streams and countless letters[7] These, O hymn, are thy powers, there are the powers of speech[8] With these for me now milk the great wealth of ambrosia Prajāpati created this prayer, the essence of the Vedas With it may I obtain all; let it win all desires greatly. Thou art *bhūh*, *bhuvah*, and *svar*, the three, thou art the Veda[9] Milk, O prayer,[10] children for me Life and breath milk for me. Cattle and folk milk for me Prosperity and glory milk for me The world (to come), splendour of renown, courage, prosperity in sacrifice, milk for me.' All this he makes the Adhvaryu repeat, if he does not know (the Mantras) Then being urged on to sacrifice (by the Adhvaryu, who says), '*Om*,[11] offer the Soma singer of the hymn,'

*pinvdt* (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 716), the nom. of the participle, or *pinvati*, reading *dhenuh* The Jaiminiya Upanisad *pinvate* may arise from a misreading of *t* or *t*

[5] *Gôbhagam* may mean 'prospering cows', and *varsâpavitram*, 'purifying by rains' *Prthi vyuparâm* is *yupasya mûlam* (Sayana) If this is correct (cf n. 3), the next adjective may belong to it or to *tâpastanu*, but it is much more likely to be merely = 'beyond the earth', as in the Jaiminiya Upanisad, which has *Varunaparyyatanam* and *annasubham*, 'pleasant through food'

[6] Apparently we must follow Sayana and supply *munisarirayatam* or something similar The verses are late in character, and *tâpastanu* might mean 'lean through penance', but the translation of Oertel 'having penance as a body' is at least as probable (cf the accent) The *uktha* is blindly praised

[7] *Dûhanam* is taken as nom neut Sayana renders it as with *gokulam* *Ayutaksaram* is due, he says, to the fact that there are so many syllables in the *dohanaprakarana*, *vasûnâm pavitram asi sahasradhâram* (Taittiriya Samhitā, I, 1, 3 1, Maitrayanī Samhitā I, 1, 3) He takes *ayutaksaram* and *sahâsradhâram* as accus agreeing with *amrtam* They are perhaps more probably nominative

[8] Or, as Sayana, 'these sounds are thy powers.' Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p 300*) reads *ukthabhir vayah* The other seems simpler *uktha* and *vac* are easily identified, or rather the latter lies at the base of the former For *apyysant*, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, §§ 921 925, 573 c, Delbruck *Altindische Syntax*, pp 352, 353

[9] The conjecture *vedasi* for *vedâ asi* is easy, but unnecessary, cf n 11 on III, 2, 4, RV, II, 6, 7, I 45, 6, II, 3, 6, III, 14, 3, &c. See also Asvalayana Grhya Sutra, I, 15, 3 for *veda 'si* To take *traye*, &c, as a separate Mantra is wrong

[10] Sâyana takes *brahma* as accusâtive I prefer to regard it as vocative, despite the apparent parallelism of the next sentences For another neuter voc, cf II 7, n 1 Kātyayana Śrauta Sutra VII, 4 13 has *prajâm me dhuksva*, and also *âyur me dhuksva, pasûn me dhuksva* On the other hand Atharvaveda, X, 8, 25 has *adhak—brahma ca tapas ca*

[11] Cf V, 3 3 The Adhvaryu utters the *praisa* twice, see Āsvalāyana Śrauta Sutra, I 5, 3 *ekaikam presito yajati* See Sabbathier, *Agnistoma*, p 58, for the phrase, and for the gen, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 297 b, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 160

uttering the cry, 'We who sacrifice,' he offers sacrifice with the usual[12] (stanza), and holding back as it were his breath, repeats a secondary *vasat*[13] The accompaniment of the *vasat* is described elsewhere[14] The Adhvaryu brings up the vessel containing the libation and the (three) *atigrāhya* bowls[15] As soon as he perceives the food, the Hotr descends from the swing towards the east[16]

[12] RV, VII, 23, 1, see Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 15, 23 *piba somam Indra mandatu tvetı yājyā*, and VII, 11, 27 For the *aguh*, see ibid, I, 5, 3, 4 *āgur 3 yyadir anuyajavarjam* ‖ 4 ‖ *ye 3 yajamaha ity aguh* See also Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, pp 101 sq. *Neu- und Vollmondsopfer*, p 95. Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIV, 31, n 1.

[13] *Anuvasatkr* is freely used as a compound verb in the Aitareya Brahmana (I, 22, 4, &c), Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, and Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra and should be written as one word *Vyavanya* is rendered *ucchvasam akrtva* by Sayana, who takes *iva* as *eva* The reason for the expression *anuvasat* is given in Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur* p 102, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 351, n 1 After the *yajya* the Hotr says *deva 3 vau 3 sat* and *somasyāgne vihı 3 vau 3 sat*, thus making two *vau 3 sat* cries For the *vasatkara*, cf Āpastamba, Yajñaparibhāṣā, 96 (*S B E*, XXX, 341) The words *somasyagne vihı* occur in Aitareya Brahmana, III, 5, 4, 6 Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, V, 5, 19, and the brevity of this passage is only explained by the fact (see the following note) that the writer clearly knew the Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra (cf Introd, p 19) cf the relation of Gṛhya Sutra and Śrauta Sūtra in the case of Āśvalayana and Śāṅkhāyana Oldenberg, who once thought the evidence was in favour of assigning the two Sūtras of Śaṅkhayana to different epochs, has now abandoned the attempt and leaves the question open (see *S B E*, XXIX, 5, 6 XXX, xxxiii sq), while I am inclined to think that there is no evidence worth counting against the traditional authorship in either case

[14] Cf Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sutra, I, 5 17 *vag ojah saha ojo mayı pranāpanav ıtı vasatkaram uktvoktanumantrayate* | This is a direct reference Cf also Aitareya Brāhmana, III, 8, 9 where it reads *tan anumantrayeta vag oja saha ojo mayı prāṇāpanau ıty atman eva tad hota vacam ca pranapanau ca sthapayatı sarvayuh sarvayutvaya* The reference here might be supposed to be to the Brahmana passage and not to the Śrauta Sutra, but the use of *anumantranam* and the mode of reference are hopelessly opposed to this view The style of reference is reminiscent of Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sutra, I, 1, 1 *uktanı vaitanıkanı gṛhyanı vaksyamah* which is a clear reference to the Śrauta Sutra, and I think an assertion of the identity of authorship It may be noted that, although Oldenberg (*S B E*, XXIX, 158) clearly indicates that he has some novel view on the relations of Śaunaka and Āśvalāyana, he does not (in *S B E*, XXX) carry out his promise of discussing the point, save that (ibid p xxxv n 2) he alludes to the fact that Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 7, 16, quotes a *yajñagatha* by Śaunaka. This of course in no way contradicts the view of the relation as pupil and teacher reflected on the tradition of the Kathāsaritsāgara and recorded in the most precise terms by Ṣaḍguruśiṣya The B version of the Bṛhaddevatā, which probably was composed by a pupil of Śaunaka's distinctly quotes Āśvalāyana, which suits the tradition admirably (p. 293, note*)

[15] Cf Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra VII, 5 22, Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 21, 10, *ucchvasam akrtva ıty arthah* They are drawn 'over and above' (*ati*) Weber, *Ind Stud*, IX, 235, Eggeling, *S B E*, XXVI, 402, n 4, XLI, 6, n 1

[16] Cf I, 2, 43 Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, II, 17, Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 21, 6, 7 For *yathā na* with fut., cf. Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax* pp 296 sq, Speyer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, §§ 197, 277 This case illustrates admirably the origin of the use in its relation of *iti* and the 2nd person, see also Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā, II 2, 7, IV, 1, 9, Taittirīya Saṃhitā II 2, 5 1, *J R A S*, 1909

Then they tie up the swing to the west that it may not slay the reciter when about to eat. For the Hotr eats seated on the place of the swing. Then the Hotr consumes the (libation in the) vessel with the words uttered in response,[17] 'May speech, the deity, rejoice in the Soma,' 'May Soma, the king, shower life on me for my breath,' 'May my breath milk mightily all life' The third pressing (in this rite) is taken over[18] from the last day of the Abhiplava rite, except as regards the hymn containing *nivids* addressed to the All-gods (RV, I, 89) In its place are inserted forty-one verses of the 'water' hymn of Dirghatamas, 'Of that noble grey sacrificer' (RV, I, 164) and the hymn *ānobhadriya* (RV, I, 89) The strophe and antistrophe of the Vaiśvadeva Śastra are taken over from the one day form[19] (the Viśvajit) If the Yajñayajñiya Saman is omitted,[20]

[17] *Upasr tena* is explained by Sayana as *uttaranujñāpurvakena*, the word occurs often in Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, but not in a parallel passage. Cf, however, XVIII, 1, 12 The verse *vag devi (jusanā) somasya trpyatu* is found in Vajasaneyi Samhita, VIII, 37, and elsewhere, Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance* p. 853[b] *Sa me*, &c., is a quasi verse It is tempting to render *ayuh* as if it were a dative, 'may Soma rain on me for life for breath,' and it might possibly be so taken as the sentence is a Mantra and therefore not to be judged by the ordinary rules of prose (cf Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p viii) In that case *ayuhpranaya* would not be a *tatpurusa* compound, since 'the breath of life' is not in Sanskrit *ayuhprana*, nor yet a *dvandva*, but rather a case in which the mere base is accepted as sufficient to denote the case relation when followed by a case form in a parallel word cf e g RV, I, 26, 9, where Max Müller would so render (see Oldenberg, *S B E*, XLVI, 15) *amrta mártyanam*, and see Pischel, *Vedische Studien* I 60 sq, 225 sq, Jacobi, *Gott gel Anz*, 1880, p. 855, Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, I, xvii, and II, 1, 157, who accepts this view of RV, I, 26, 9 Cf, however, Aitareya Brahmana *l c* on n. 14 where *sarvayuh sarvayutvaya* occurs. The gen is one of partitive force, cf Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 160, Monro, *Homeric Grammar*[2], p. 146 For loc with *as*, cf Aitareya Brahmana, VI, 3, 10 for acc exx. in *Ind Stud*, IX 295

[18] For the Abhiplava, see Āśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra, VII, 6, Eggeling *S B E*, XXVI, 403 It has six days. The hymn referred to is RV, I, 89, cf Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVIII, 21, 8 The hymn, RV, I, 164, 1, is called *salila* also in Śāṅkhayana Aranyaka, II, 18, and Śrauta Sutra, XVIII, 22 7 It is of course derived from v 41, *gaurir mimaya salilani taksati*, cf. also Brhaddevata IV, 43

[19] The Vaiśvadeva Śastra begins therefore with RV, V, 82, 1–3, 4–6 The contents of it and the Agnimaruta are given in full in I, 5, 3, which explains the brevity with which they are here treated Śāṅkhayana Śrauta Sutra, XVIII, 22 (cf Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka, II, 18), gives the Śastra as RV, V, 82, 1–3 4–6, IV, 53, I, 160, I, 161, I, 164 (the whole), and I, 89 with *nivids*, and V, 53 5, as a *paridhaniya* *Anobhadriya* is used as a name of I 89 also in Rgvidhana, I, 20, 5, but Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance* p 169[b]) does not cite this passage, which is earlier

[20] The Agnimaruta for the Śāṅkhayana is given in detail in Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra, XVIII, 23, cf Āranyaka, II, 18 It consists of RV, III, 3, V, 55, the Yajñayajñiya or a substitute, VI, 48, not noted by Bloomfield (*Vedic Concordance*, p. 735[a]) who omits also any reference to this passage, I, 141 If the Yajñayajñiya Saman is employed, the Āgnimāruta Śastra constitutes itself in the Aitareya thus RV, III, 2, I, 43 6, V, 55, VI, 48, 1 and 2, VII, 17, 11 and 12, I, 99, 1, X, 9, 1, &c, the rest being as in the *prakrti* (Sāyana) If the Ilanda Saman is

then the strophe and antistrophe (in the Āgnimāruta Śastra) consist of the six stanzas beginning, 'O Agni, thy fame, thy strength' (RV, X, 140, 1) when the Ilanda Saman is employed (three stanzas being used) If more (than three) are used in this Sāman, then so many are employed (in the Śastra) as the antistrophe, beginning, 'Agni, for ourselves as it were' (RV., X, 21, 1) Thus is completed the Mahāvrata and this day and the Agniṣṭoma[21] At the proper time they should carry the swing to the bath, and burn together the seats

3 No one[1] who has not been initiated should recite the Mahavrata, nor

used, then for the two *pragathas*, VI, 48, 1 and 2, and VII, 17, 11 and 12, are substituted X, 140, 1–3, and 4 6 respectively, being the two parts of the Ilanda Saman If, however, all the six stanzas (X, 140, 1–6) are used for the *stotriya*, then X, 21, 1 6, must form the *anurupa* So Śankhayana, who gives further variations For the Ilānda cf Oldenberg *Gott gel Anz*, 1908 p 714

[21] The Mahavrata is a form of the Agnistoma and so in a sense the Agnistoma is finished The utensils and the swing are both cleansed, while the *vedi* and the *brsis* are both consumed by fire Śankhayana Śrauta Sūtra XVIII, 24, develops the final close of the ceremony in some detail The Āranyaka, II, 18, has *tad Agnistomah samtisthate* The burning points clearly to an original sun spell The question, however, has recently been raised whether the use of fire is not merely piacular, cf Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* p 151, n 4, Westermarck, *Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*, I, 56 n 3 The usual view is that both the burning and the waving of torches in such rites are intended to evoke heat by magic Cf Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, p 84

[1] Sayana as usual, ignores the difficulties of this passage (1) The words *ity eke* most probably refer to the whole passage (cf III 2, 4, n 2), because the very first prohibition contradicts the passage above V, 1, 5 n 5, when the case of an *adiksita* Hotr is deliberately discussed The sense then must be as Eggeling (*S B E*, XLIII, 367, n 1) takes it, that (1) no one but a *diksita* can recite, and even he only (2) if there is a *cityagni*, and (3) a year long *sattra* and (4) not even he for another unless he be father or teacher It may be noted that Śankhayana Aranyaka, I 1, prohibits recitation to another, save in the case of *sattrins* and of a father and a teacher, which corresponds with the rule here, since *sattrins* of course are entitled to recite for one another But ibid, I, 5 and Śrauta Sutra XVII, 13, 6, regard a *cityagni* as optional, perhaps a later idea (cf Weber, *Ind Stud* XIII, 117, n.) The rule of those here cited thus excludes the Mahavrata as anything but a *sattra* Katyayana Śrauta Sutra, XVI, 1, 2, insists on an altar at the Mahavrata (Eggeling *S B E*, XLIII xxv, n 2) But it should be noted that this is inconsistent with the exception of the father and the teacher, for they could only be concerned—being *ex hypothesi* not *sattrins* in an *ekaha* or *ahina* rite Possibly however the view that one can recite for a father or teacher does not contemplate the case of an *ahina* or *ekaha*, but means that in a *sattra* the sacrificer may carry out the sacrifice for the benefit of his father or teacher though they are not initiated and cannot take part themselves, this view I incline to think the most probable, despite Dr Friedlander's view (p 29, n 2) It cannot mean that, the teacher or father being *diksita*, the Hotr recited for them only, for in the Mahāvrata all the *sattrins* equally obtain the benefits of the rite (cf Eggeling, *S B E*, XLIII, xxv sq), and therefore are forbidden to perform for others outside the circle of the initiated,* cf Śatapatha

* It may be noted that the prohibition of performing sacrifices by other than Brahmins is ascribed in the Śatapatha Brahmana, II, 3 1, 39 (cf Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra, IV, 14 11, Max

should he recite it when there is no altar, nor should one recite it for another, nor if it does not last a year, so say some Only one may recite it for a father or a teacher, for that is recited for oneself[2] (The only[3] utterance (of the

Brāhmana, IX, 5, 2, 12 and 13, X, 5, 2, 5 (2) Presumably for this reason Sayana renders the passage as equivalent to 'no one who is not *dīksita* should recite the Mahavrata at another's sacrifice (i e an *ahina* or *ekaha*) unless there is a *cityagni*, or unless that other is a father or a teacher His explanation is that the Mahavrata is of three forms, *ekaha*, *ahina*, and *sattra* As in the *sattra*, the *yajamana* and Hotṛ are identical, then the *diksa* is automatic. In the other two rites the Hotr is not the *yajamana*, and may be either *dīksita* or *adiksita* In the Agnistoma, &c, if *svarthe* he is *dīksita* as these are Soma sacrifices (cf Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p. 125) If the sacrifice is not a Soma one then he is not Only the *dīksita* can perform at a *parakiya mahavratakarman*, and he only if there is a *cityagni* But all this is very difficult and inconsistent The *nasamvatsara ity eke* he takes as a separate prohibition confined to one school But this seems less likely (3) Max Muller, *S B E*, I, 266, 267, takes the passage thus 'No one who is adikshita, uninitiated, should recite it for another person, nor should he do so, when the Mahavrata is performed without (or with) an altar, or if it does not last one year' But this hardly makes sense, since an *adiksita* can never recite if there is a *sattra*, and the construction of the sentence shows that the series of prohibitions is not directed to an *adiksita* but to a priest in general He is not to recite if *adiksita*, nor if there is no fire, &c. Dr Friedlander, on Śankhayana Aranyaka, I, 1, follows Max Muller, without commenting on the difficulties. (4) The only other possibility is to render, 'No one who is not initiated must recite, nor must one recite if there is no fire, nor for another (i e. allowing *ahinas* and *ekahas* if by chance the *yajamana* is the Hotr in fact)' Some say, 'nor if it be not a *sattra* One may recite for a father, &c In this case the passage confirms in part the view that there was probably a *cityagni* at the *ekaha* and *ahina* rites, Eggeling *S B E* XLIII, xxv

[2] Śankhayana Aranyaka, I, 1, has *atmane hai 'asya tac chastam bhavati* The one gives the body, the other learning *Atmana* here is no doubt correct as less easy than *atmane* It is a predicative possessive gen, as in I, 2, 2, n 8 Cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 298, Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 64 For *asya*, cf. Caland, *Ueber das rit Sutra des Baudh* pp 44 45

[3] Savana says *atra kecid vakyantaram adhiyate* This can hardly refer to recitation, and throws grave doubt on Winternitz's interpretation of a similar phrase in Haradatta (*Mantra patha* I, xix) The passage is given in all the MSS., but it cannot be original In addition to being quite out of place, it is almost unintelligible here It is a general description of the *praisa* of the Adhvaryu in the case of Śastras, whether accompanied by *Nārāśamsibhyacamasas* or not. In the case of the Hotr's Śastras the *praisa* is *uktha a yaja somasya* In the case of the Hotrakas, what it is is disputed Sayana says (1) some supply *ukthaśī yaja somanam* (cf Katyayana Śrauta Sūtra, IX, 13 33 (*somasya*), 14, 12 (*somanam*), Apastamba Śrauta Sūtra, XII, 27, 19 (*somasya*), 28, 14 (*somanam*)) and make this the *praisa*, (2) others, *so 'yam arthah prakrtita eva prapta iti matva*, reject the passage, (3) others repeat *ukthaśa yaja somasya*, and assume the mention here is *hotrakanam śastresu viśesavidhanartham* The second alternative is the most probable The words *ukthaśa—somanam*, which appear in the text after *hotrakanam*, are certainly spurious and cannot have been read even by Sayana, whose note would be

Müller *S B E*, XXX, 321), to the fact that Brahmins only can eat the remains of a sacrifice The reason is no doubt a reflex of the doctrine of the presence of the divinity in the sacrifice (which in certain cases forbids any eating whatever, e g Āśvalay[illegible]hya Sutra IV, 8, 31), for which see my article in the *J R A S*, 1907, pp 939 sq [illegible]obertso[illegible] *of Sem*, I, 276 sq

Adhvaryu) on the Hotr's Śastras, whether accompanied or not by libations for Narāśamsa, is 'Offer the Soma with the hymn', and it also occurs in the Hotraka's Śastras) This day one should not teach to one who is not a regular pupil, and has not been so for a year, assuredly not to one who has not been so for a year, nor to one who is not a *brahmacārin* and does not belong to the same school,[4] assuredly not to one who does not belong to the same school, nor to one who has not come to that place[5] There should not be more than one saying or twice, twice only[6] 'One man should tell it to one,' says Jatūkarnya 'Not to a child or a man in the third stage of life'[7] Nor standing to one standing, nor walking to one walking, nor lying to one lying nor seated on a couch to one so seated, but seated on the ground to one so seated (should the teacher teach) Nor (should the pupil) lean backwards,[8] nor forwards, nor be over clothed, nor adopt postures, but he should raise his knees, without wearing special apparel, and so learn He should not learn when he has eaten flesh, or seen blood, or a dead body, or done what is unlawful, or anointed (his eyes) or oiled or rubbed his body, or had himself shaved, or bathed, or has put on colour, or put on a wreath, or had intercourse, or written,[9] or obliterated

unintelligible if he had had them before him The reason for their insertion is obvious For the libations of *L Agnistoma* p 220 The gen is presumably partitive, cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 67 V 3, 2, n 17

[4] Cf Gautama Sutra, XIV, 21, and Buhler's note in his translation (*S B E*, II), where he differentiates it from *sahādhyāya* Here, however, it is perhaps used in that usual sense

[5] Where the teacher lives He is not to go to the pupil's house

[6] Because it is so sacred According to Sayana, Jatukarnya insists on one lecture only to one person at a time, and the same teacher to avoid *sampradayavicheda*

[7] This sentence must also belong to Jatukarnya This seems the proper way to interpret the *iti* which, however Sayana explains as *śisyaprayuktantevāsasamāptyarthah*, and so Max Muller takes it For the idea cf *Manu*, VIII, 66, &c

[8] I e lean on a *kudi* (or a wall, &c, Apastamba Dharma Sutra, I 2, 6, 17), or rest with his hands on a stick (on the ground Āpastamba, l c., 17) The other renderings follow Sayana, who gives *ucchritadyakramana* for *nauratyam akramya*, cf Aśvalayana Śrauta Sūtra XII 8, 19. For *atvantah*, cf Manu, VIII 23 *samvitangah* For *napitena karayitvā* he has *nakhaniskrnta nadi* cf Śānkhāyana Gṛhya Sutra VI, 1 6, and for the syntax, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, pp 224 sq He takes *naktva* as referring to the eyes. *Varnakenanulipya* he refers to sandal or saffron being smeared on, for *varnaka* cf Bohtlingk, *Dict*, VI 24 For *anapaśrita* ibid., I, 41 For these rules, cf Āpastamba, I, 2 6, 23-27

[9] These translations follow Sayana and Max Muller Though they no longer 'seem to be the earliest mention of actual writing in Sanskrit literature', in view of the discoveries of Buhler, *Indische Palaeographie* and *Ind Stud* III (1898), Hoernle, *J A S B*, LXIX, pt i, Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, ch VII and others they are interesting Writing on palm leaves may be meant rather than on wood The violent repugnance to writing shown here and elsewhere is certainly in favour of this view, accepted by Macdonell (*Sanskrit Literature*, p 16) and Winternitz (*Gesch der indisch Litt*, I, 29), that writing first came into use on the South Western Coast through commerce and that MSS are later For a different but very improbable view, cf R Shamasastry, *Ind Ant* 1906, *J R A S*, 1907 pp 426, 427

writing. 'He should not finish learning this in one day,' says Jātūkarṇya 'He should do so,' says Gālava 'He should finish all before the sets of eighty tristichs, and resting[10] in another place learn the rest,' says Āgniveśyāyana. Where he learns this, he should learn nothing else, but where he learns something else he may at will learn this there also He who does not study this does[11] not become a *snātaka*, even though he study much else, yet if he study not this, he does not become a *snātaka* Nor should he forget this, even though he forgets something else, he should not forget this Assuredly[12] never should he forget this If he forget not this, let him know that it is enough for himself[13] Let him know that truly it is enough[14] He who knows this should not communicate[15] nor dine nor amuse himself with one who knows this not

Now[16] we shall set forth the rules of study When the old water about

[10] *Śamayamanaḥ* is taken as *samāpayan* by Sāyana, which is possible I follow Max Muller On the passage as a whole, cf Oldenberg *Prolegomena*, p 293. On the form Āgniveśyāyana, cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1219 It occurs as a name of a grammarian in the Taittiriya Prātiśākhya XIV 32 Agniveśya occurs in the Vamśas in Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanisad, II 6, 2, and IV, 6, 2 in both Kānva and Mādhyandina Śākhās (Max Müller *S B E*, XV, 118, n, 186, n) Jātūkarṇya (the word is found in the *gaṇa, gargādi*) occurs in the same passages with Gālava. The spelling seems clearly Jātu° though in Max Muller's translation the two forms Jatu° and Jatū° occur Jatukarṇya occurs in Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka VIII, 10 and frequently in the Śāṅkhāyana Śrauta and Gṛhya Sutras (III 10 1) Kātyāyana's Śrauta Sutra the Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhya, and in Kausitaki Brāhmaṇa, XXVI 5 Gālava is known to Nirukta IV, 3, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, II 6 3 IV, 6 3, Bṛhaddevatā, and Pāṇini as a grammarian see Max Muller *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya* p 6

[11] 'Should not become' is Sāyana's version Literally it must be 'is not a (true) *snātaka*'. Cf Āpastamba Dharma Sutra I 2, 8, 27 The exact force of the optative is rather doubtful it may be that it is the indefinite use of which examples undoubtedly occur in Sanskrit (cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 283 also in III 2, 1 n 1 and Introd, p 61) or it may be an opt in protasis with the apod in the indic. to denote the certainty of the result though the rule of similarity of mood is usually strictly observed in the older language see Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar* § 581 f who enforces his rule partly by alterations in the text of the Maitrāyaṇī Samhita (see his review of v Schroeder's ed., *P A O S* Oct. 1887) *J R A S*, 1909, p 153

[12] Sāyana says that this is read by some only It is in all the MSS, but is an easy addition Cf n. 14. *Ao* here and above follows a negative sentence and is practically merely an emphatic negative as usual in classical Sanskrit, Speijer *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*, § 240, *Sanskrit Syntax* § 402 R 1, cf Caland, *Ueber das rit Sutra des Baudh.*, p 51

[13] Sāyana renders *purusārthāya* and Max Muller gives as possible for acquiring a knowledge of the self For the dat. cf II 4 2 *Ātman* however is merely the ordinary reflexive Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 127, Delbruck *Altindische Syntax*, pp 208 261

[14] This again Sāyana says, is read only by some and as it is one of those easy additions it cannot be accepted as genuine Naturally a chapter of this kind lies open beyond others to such interpolations as this.

[15] Sāyana renders *samudditet* as 'study with' (*tasya purata grantham uccam na pathet*). The sense is probably 'enter into discussion with' *evamvid* and *anevamvid* here are clearly compounds cf Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* II, 1 68

[16] Then come general rules for all Vedic study not for the Mahāvrata alone These are found both

the roots of the trees has been dried up,[17] he should not study, nor in the forenoon,[18] when the shadows meet, nor in the afternoon, nor when a thick cloud has risen; and when rain[19] falls out of season he should stop his study of the Veda[20] *for three nights, nor in this time*[21] *should he tell tales, nor even*

in Gṛhya and Dharma Sutras (Oldenberg, *S B.E*, XXX, xxxiv, xxxv); Khādira Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 11; cf Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 8, VI, 1; Hillebrandt, *Ritual Litteratur*, p 56 and reff, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9–11; Gautama Dharma Sūtra, XVI, with Buhler's notes.

[17] The time after the full moon of Pausa, i e. January–February is meant, cf. Weber, *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Naxatra*, II, 322 sq., Oldenberg, *S B E*, XXX, 77, n; Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, I, 3, 9, 2, with Buhler's note, Manu, IV, 95, Yājñavalkya, I, 142, 143 The four months after the full moon of Āsāḍha are forbidden in Sankhāyana, VI, 2, 1 The term is five months, beginning in the middle of Śravana, Gautama Dharma Sutra, XVI, 1 sq; of Prausṭhapada, Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 3, 1; Khādira Gṛhya Sūtra, III, 2, 16. Śravana is also given by Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sutra, III, 5, 2, 3; Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra, IV, 5, 2; Pāraskara Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 10, 2; Hiraṇyakeśi Gṛhya Sūtra, II, 18, 1. The tmesis *upa napite* is very unusual, but *upapurāne* would be almost equally strange, though not impossible *Kaksodake* is a curious expression, as explained by Sāyana The separation of prefix and verb is (see Caland, *Ueber das rit Sutra des Baudh*, pp 48, 49) rare in the late Sūtra style and is difficult to assume here, though this may be quoted from an older (? metrical) text *Upapurana* seems elsewhere unknown in the sense 'somewhat (?) old'. Nothing is indeed more characteristic of the Vedic Sanskrit than the separation of particle and verb Holtzmann (*Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata*, p 48) says that the only example* in the Epic occurs in a pseudo Vedic hymn to the Aśvins, I, 3, 62 · *devā adhi viśve viṣaktaḥ* Even the Bṛhaddevatā has no certain case of such separation On Jacobi's theories of the beginning of the year (*Festgruss an Roth*, pp 68–74), see Whitney, *J A.O S*, XVI, lxxxii sq, Buhler, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 238–249 (dates of the commencement of Vedic study at p 249), Thibaut, ibid, XXIV, 85–100, Oldenberg *Z D M G*, L, 451 sq

[18] When study is permissible (hardly 'at any time as in Max Muller), he must not so study in the forenoon or afternoon, when shadows are meeting, i e he should begin at sunrise when the shadows first appear, and cease before sunset when they again disappear (Sāyana).

[19] For the case of a cloud, cf Āpastamba, I, 3, 11, 31 Rain out of season (ibid, 27, Manu, III, 104, combines the two into a cloud out of the ordinary in the rains) is explained by Sayana as rain falling in months other than Śrāvana and Bhādrapada, August and September, or according to the Smṛtikāras, under Nakṣatras other than the 13 from Ārdrā to Jyeṣṭha

[20] The study of Vedāngas, like *vyakarana*, is not prohibited (Sāyana) He adds *ardrādi jyeṣṭhantasya trayodaśanakṣatraparimitasya kalasya vrstikalatvam abhyupetya tato 'nyatra vrstau satyam akalavrstinimittam triratradhyayanavarjanam ichanti*

[21] *Asmin* is vague Sayana gives either *adhiyamāne svadhyaye* or *mahavratadhyayanakale* The rendering 'at that time' of Max Muller is perhaps intended to refer to the *trirātram*, since the translation continues 'not even during the night, nor should he glory in his knowledge', since *asya* seems to be taken with *ratrau* *Triratram*, of course, includes days, so that the rendering is quite possible, though probably the first of Sāyana's alternatives is correct For the acc, cf Speijer, *Vedische und Sanskrit Syntax*, § 28 and reff The instr is one of separation, ibid, § 33, Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 283 The usual case is the abl, Speijer, § 52, Delbruck, *Altindische Syntax*, p 446, who ignore this passage

* But cf. the warning as to Holtzmann's accuracy in Buhler, *Ind Ant*, XXIII, 146, and Winternitz's review there cited. In this case the fact seems substantially correct

at night at this time be fain to set them forth[22] 'This'[23] is the name of this great being He who knows thus 'this' as the name of it, becomes *brahman*

[22] The text reads *nasya ratrau ca na ca kirtayiset* Sayana, followed by Max Muller, takes this as consisting of two sentences (1) *nasya ratrau ca*, (2) *na ca kirtayiset* Sayana renders, (1) *kimcasya mahavratasya patham ratrau na kuryat*, (2) *kimca mahavratabhijño 'ham iti evam janamadhye kirtim api necchet* Max Muller's version, which is much more probable, is cited above But 'not even at night' would more properly be *na ratrau cana* than *na ratrau ca* cf III, 1, 3 *naitdyumne cana*. Further *kirtayiset* is quite impossible The form required is *cikirtayiset*, and no easier error than *cana cikirtayiset* being changed to *cana ca kirtayiset* can well be conceived Then the whole must mean I think, 'nor even at night in this time (probably *adhiyamane svadhyaye*) should one be fain to proclaim (tales)' The *adhyayana* takes place during the day (see above) and neither then nor *even* at night, when the *adhyayana* stops, is the telling of tales to be permitted. For the form *cikirtayiset*, an opt desid from a denominative (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 1056), see Whitney, § 1068 Such forms are very rare, hence the non recognition of this case by the commentators. Cf also Aitareya Brahmana III, 30 *vaci kalpayisan* where Aufrecht (p 430) proposes to read *cikalpayisan* (presumably by haplography for *vaci cikalpayisan*), I, 24, 5 *alulobhayisat* (cf Liebich, *Panini*, p 32 n) Apastamba Srauta Sutra XII, 24 5 *bibhaksayiset*, Kathaka Samhita, XXII 3 *pipayayiset*, *Ind Stud*, IX, 264, Holtzmann, *Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata*, p 46

[23] Sayana renders followed by Max Muller, 'This, the *krtsnadhyayavakyam mahavratavakyam va*, thus learned (= *iti*) is the name of the *paramatman*.' He explains that the Veda produces *brahman* and so is identified with it and its sacred character resulting from this power causes the long list of *niyamas* here given This cannot be right. The word *tad* is the name of the *brahman*, see I 3 4 where this is most expressly stated

The end of the section renders it probable that it may be accepted as coming from Śaunaka Otherwise the passage would be suspect since it contains passages whose genuineness was doubted even before Sayana and the possibility of it all being an interpolation cannot be entirely excluded The use of *brahman* is striking especially in the pred, and confirms the view that *brahmā* is not to be found save on good grounds in any early texts. For Atharvaveda IX, 35 2, see Weber *Ind Stud* XVIII 140 for Maitrayani Samhitā, II, 9 1 see v Schroeder, *Ind Lit*, p. 91, n 1 Muir, *Texts* V, 323 finds him in Śatapatha Brahmana XI 5 6, 9 &c, but needlessly Hopkins *Religion of India* p 195, and Oldenberg *Buddha*[4], p. 30 n 1, are vague The *St Petersburg Dict*, V, 138, cites Taittiriya Brāhmana, II, 7, 17, 1, as the oldest passage, but Sāyana's view may be wrong and none of the passages in Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p 168 are necessarily so taken He occurs, of course in the Taittiriya Aranyaka X, but that is not early, though its lateness has been needlessly exaggerated on insufficient grounds. Eggeling (cf *S B E.*, XLIV, 515) finds him nowhere in the comparatively late Śatapatha, though he appears in the Bṛhadāranyaka Upanisad (cf Deussen *Phil of the Upanishads*, pp. 172 sq), and in the later Upanisads and in the earliest Buddhist texts, which however can only be doubtfully dated.

# APPENDIX

## ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA VII–XV

THIS Appendix contains the text of Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, VII–XV, edited from the Berlin MS Orient, fol 630 (A)[1] and Bodleian MS Sansk e 2[2] (B) The Bodleian MS, which is at least 200 years old, save for ff 65 and 87 which were replaced in A D 1781, is extremely accurate on the whole, and the text which it presents is in most cases also supported by parallel readings in other Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas In many cases the old method of denoting the *e*, *ai*, *o*, *au* is retained, but not consistently, showing that the MS belongs to the period of transition to the new style. Frequent errors are (1) the reduction of double consonant to single, e g *tare dviṣantam*, XII, 20, (2) the insertion of a needless *h*, e g *sapatnahkṣayanam*, XII, 19 this may be a mere graphical sign as apparently in the Mānava Gṛhya Sūtra[3], (3) haplography, e g *pramiye tare(d)*, XII, 20, hence probably *bhaviṣyati* for *bhaviṣyatīti* in IX, 7, (4) the writing of *ī* for *i*, e g *marīcir*, VIII, 7 Many, though not all, of these errors have been corrected in a later hand, or sometimes by the first hand in the margin The most serious source of error is probably omission, see e g VIII, 2, n 7, 4, n 3 As usual *ch* is written for *cch* in all cases,[4] and *l* replaces *ḷ*, I have restored *cch* and *ḷ* Further as the text is attached to the Ṛgveda, I have treated two verbal prefixes as each separate and accented, as usual in the text of the Ṛgveda[5] Both MSS agree in several errors, e g the omission of *trayasya* and the reading *sicyet* (for *sicyeta*) in VIII, 2

The following list gives the correspondence between the two texts of the Aitareya and the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyakas —

| AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA | ŚĀṄKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA. |
|---|---|
| Śānti verses (pp 75, 76) | VII 1 |
| III, 1, 1 | VII, 2 |
| III 1, 2 | VII, 3 |
| — | VII, 4–7 |

[1] See Weber, *Berlin Catal*, II, 5 Keith *J R A S*, 1908 p 363, n 2

[2] Described in Winternitz and Keith's *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, pp 59 60 Purchased in 1886 for the Library through Dr Thibaut

[3] Knauer, *Manava Gṛhya Sutra*, pp xxxii, xxxiii

[4] See above, p 10, n 2, Macdonell, *J R A S*, 1907 p 1105

[5] Macdonell *Vedic Grammar*, p 107

| Aitareya Āraṇyaka. | Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka. |
|---|---|
| III, 1, 4. | VII, 8; 9 |
| III, 1, 3 | VII, 10 |
| III, 1, 5 | VII, 11–13 |
| III, 1, 6 | VII, 14–16 |
| — | VII, 17 |
| III, 1, 6. | VII, 18; 19 |
| — | VII, 20 |
| (Cf II, 6) | VII, 21. |
| — | VII, 22. |
| III, 2, 1. | VIII, 1 |
| III, 2, 2. | VIII, 2. |
| III, 2, 3. | VIII, 3; 4 |
| III, 2, 3; 4 | VIII, 5 |
| III, 2, 4 | VIII, 6. |
| III, 2, 4, 5 | VIII, 7 |
| III, 2, 5 | VIII, 8; 9 |
| III, 2, 6. | VIII, 10; 11. |

The verses in Adhyāya XII sometimes make nonsense, and could be corrected from the parallel texts. But all that can usefully be done is to edit what apparently was the text of the Āraṇyaka, recognizing that it already contained much that in the course of oral tradition had become corrupted. This is the principle on which Winternitz has edited the Mantrapāṭha,[1] and is the only sound method of procedure

[1] See his Preface, pp. xx sq

## Adhyāya VII

*Om ṛtaṃ vadiṣyāmi satyaṃ vadiṣyāmi | tan mām avatu tad vaktāram avatv avatu mām avatu vaktāram | mayi bhargo mayi mahaḥ | vāṅ me manasi pratiṣṭhitā mano me vāci pratiṣṭhitam | āvir āvir mayy[1] ā bhūr vedasmatsāraṇīḥ[2] | ṛtaṃ mā mā hiṃsīḥ | anenādhītenāhorātrān saṃdadhāmi | Agna ilā nama ilā nama ṛṣibhyo mantrakṛdbhyo mantrapatibhyo[3] namo 'stu devebhyaḥ | śivā naḥ śaṃtamā bhava sumṛḍīkā Sarasvati mā te vyoma[4] saṃdṛśi | adabdham mana iṣiram cakṣuḥ | sūryo jyotiṣāṃ śreṣṭho dīkṣe mā mā hiṃsīḥ || 1 ||*[5]

[1] mayy B., mayi Ānand. ed. of Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad [2] tidair A, Ānand [3] mantrapa… B, after which occurs a break in the MS, which has been repaired in new paper on which is supplied namo-devebhyaḥ [4] vyoma B as corrected. A has *Sarasvati* [5] See above, pp. 75, 76, and IX, 1, and for *ṛtam*, *J R A S*, 1908 p 1114

*hiti | sa ya evam etam samhitam veda samdhiyate prajaya paśubhir yaśasa brahma varcasena svargena lokena sarvam ayur eti || 5 ||*[1]

[1] 6 A B. Not in Aitareya Aranyaka.

*Prthivi purvarupam dyaur uttararupam kalah samhitett Radheyah | ity adhi daivatam | athadhyatmam | vak purvarupam mana uttararupam atma samhita | sa ya evam etam samhitam veda samdhiyate prajaya paśubhir yaśasa brahmavarca sena svargena lokena sarvam ayur eti || 6 ||*[1]

[1] 7 A B Not in Aitareya Aranyaka

*Vak purvarupam mana uttararupam vidya samhitett Pauskarasadih | sa ya evam etam samhitam veda samdhiyate prajaya paśubhir yaśasa brahmavarcasena svargena lokena sarvam ayur eti || 7 ||*[1]

[1] 8 A B Not in Aitareya Aranyaka

*Athato 'nuvyaharah | prano vamśa iti vidyat | sa ya enam pranam vamśam bruvan param upavadet chaknuvan kaścit cen manyeta pranam vamsam samadhaḥ pr mam vamśam samdhitsitum*[1] *na śaknosity aha*[2] *pranas tva vamśo hasyatity enam bruyat | atha ced aśaknuvan*[3] *manyeta pranam vamśam samadhitsis tan naśakah samdhatum pranas tva vamśo hasyatity evainam bruyat | yatha tu*[4] *katha ca bruvan vabruvan va bruyad abhyasam eva yat tat tatha syat | na tv evanyat kuśalad brahma nam bruyad | atidyumna eva brahmanam bruyat | natidyumne cana*[5] *brahmanam bruyan namo 'stu brahmanebhya iti Śauravīro Mandukeyaḥ || 8 ||*[6]

[1] *dhitsatam* B pr m *samadhitsatam* B sec m. [2] *artha* B. [3] *aśaknuvantam* B sec m [4] *nu* (?) A B [5] *vaca* A B [6] 9 A B See Aitareya Āranyaka III 1 4 Read perhaps *samadhām*

*Sa yadi pravantam vamśam bruvantam param upavadet chaknuvantam cen manyeta pranam*[1] *vamśam samadhitsisam pranam vamśam samdhitsitum*[2] *na śaknosity aha*[3] *pr nas tva vamśo hasyatity enam bruyat | atha ced aśaknuvantam manyeta pranam vamsam samadhitsis tam naśakah samdhatum pranas tva vamśo hasyatity evainam bruyat | yatha tu katha ca bruvantam vabruvantam va bruyad abhyaśam eva yat tat tatha syat | na tv evanyat kuśalad brahmanam bruyat | atidyumna eva brahmanam bruyat | natidyumne cana*[4] *brahmanam bruyan namo 'stu*[5] *brahmanebhya iti Sauravīro Mandukeyah || 9 ||*[6]

[1] *pra a* B. [2] *samadh itsatam* B pr m. [3] *situm* B sec. m [4] *artha* B [4] *na ca* A B [5] Add B sec m [6] 10 A B. See Aitareya Aranyaka III, 1 4 The reading *para* for *param* would improve the sense, though no version of 9 and 10 is satisfactory Cf A tareya Aranyaka III, 1 4 n 5

*Athato nirbhujapravadah*[1] *| prthivy ayatanam nirbhujam divayatanam pratrnnam antariksayatanam ubhayamantarena | sa ya enam*[2] *nirbhujam bruvan param upavadet prthivim devatam arah prthivi tva devata rasyatity enam bruyat | atha yadi pratrnnam bruvan param upavaded divam*[3] *devatam aro dyaus tva devata riṣyatity*

*enam brujāt | atha yadi ubhayamantarena bruvan param upavaded antariksam devatam aro ntariksam iva devata risyatiti enam*[4] *brujat | yad hi samdhim vivartayati*[5] *tan nirbhujasya rupam | atha yac chuddhe aksare abhivyaharati tat pratrnnasyāgra u evobhayamantarenobhayam vyaptam bhavati*[6] *| annadyakamo nir bhujam brujat svargakamah pratrnnam ubhayakama ubhayamantarena | sa ya enam*[2] *nirbhujam bruvan param upavaded acyostha avarabhyam sthanabhyam ity enam brujat | atha yadi pratrnnam bruvan param upavaded acyostha uttarabhyam sthanabhyam iti evamam brujat | yas tv evobhayamantarenaha tasya vasty apavadah | yatha tu katha ca bruvan vabruvan va brujad abhyasam eva yat tat tatha syat | na tv evamyat kusalad brahmanam brujat | atidyumna eva brahmanam brujat | natidyumne cana*[7] *brahmanam bruyan namo stu brahmanebhya iti Sauraviro Mandukeyah* || 10 ||[8]

[1] *nirbhujah°* A B [2] *ev a i* (*m* for ass m lated *n*) B. [3] Add B sec m [4] *evainam* A B pr m *enam* B sec m. [5] °*yanti tam* B. [6] *bhavata* B pr m [7] *na ca* A, B [8] 11 A, B See Aitareya Aranyaka III 1 3 In the latter part *bruvantam* and *para* and *upavadat* for *bruvan param* and *apavadat* seem essential giving the reasonable sense if one is rebuking one who says the *nirbhuja* the one (the latter) should say Thou hast fallen from the two lower (*avara*) places." So n the case of the *pratrnna* the t vo upper places are referred to but in the case of the *ubhayamantarena* rebuke is imposs ble and no reply is suggested It would really be more natural to put the words of the apodos s in the mouth of the rebuker but besides the difficulty of *avara* and *uttara* it is hardly possible that the section should give d rections for cursing persons who recite

*Atha khalv ahur nirbhujavaktrah | pu rvam evaksaram pu rvarupam uttaram uttararupam yakaravakarav*[1] *antarena sa samhitet | sa ya evam etam samhitam veda samdhiyate prajaya pasubh r yasasa brahmavarcasena svargena lokena sarvam ayur eti* || 11 ||[2]

[1] °*kara n* B pr m For the opposite case cf XIII 1 n 5 [2] 12 A B See Aitareya Aranyaka III 1, 5

*Atha vai vayam brumo nirbh yavaktrah sma iti ha smaha Hrasvo Mand keyah | p rvam evaksaram purvarupam uttaram uttararupam tad yasau matra puraru pottararupe antarena yena samdhim vivartayati yena matramatram vibhajati yena svarat*[1] *svaram vyanapayati sa samhitet | sa ya evam etam samhit tm veda sam dhiyate prajaya pasubhir yasasa brahmavarcasena svargena lokena sarvam ayur eti* || 12 ||[2]

[1] So A, B clearly The Aitareya has *svaratsvaram* [2] 13 A B See Aitareya Aranyaka III 1 5

*Atha ha smasya putra aha madhyamah Pratiyodhiputro*[1] *Magadhavasi | pur am evaksaram purvarupam uttaram uttararupam tad yasau matra samdhi vyanapani sama tad bhavati samavaham samhitam manya*[2] *iti | tad etad rcabhyuditam | mā na stenebhyo ye abhi druhas pade | niramino ripavo nnesu jagrdhuh | a devanam ohate vi vrayo hrdi | Brhaspate*[3] *na parah sai no vidur iti* ||[4] *sa ya evam etam samhitam*

*veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* || 13 ||[5]

[1] *Pratyedhi*° B pr m, *Pratibodhī* in Aitareya [2] *manyata* B. [3] *Bṛhaspade* B [4] = RV, II, 23, 16 [5] 14 A, B See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 5

*Vāk prāṇena saṃdhīyata ity Kauntharavyaḥ prāṇaḥ pavamānena pavamāno viśvair devair viśve devāḥ svargeṇa lokena svargo loko brahmaṇā sa eṣa avarāparā saṃhitā | sa ya evam etām avarāparāṃ saṃhitāṃ vedāvaraṃ haiva sa prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena saṃdhīyate yathaivāvarāparā saṃhitā | sa yadi pareṇa vopasṛtaḥ svena vartheṇābhivyāhared abhivyāharann eva vidyād divam saṃhitāgamad viduṣo devān abhivyāharārtham evam bhaviṣyatīty etenāvarāpareṇa tathā haiva tad bhavati* || 14 ||[1]

[1] 15 A, B See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6

*Mātā pūrvarūpam pitottararūpam prajā saṃhitiḥ Bhārgavaḥ | tad etad ekam eva*[1] *sarvam abhyanuktam | mātā ca hy evedam pitā ca prajā ca sarvam | sarvaditi saṃhitā*[2] *| aditir hy evedam sarvam yad idam kiṃcid viśvabhūtam | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | aditir dyaur aditir antarikṣam | aditir mātā sa pitā sa putraḥ | viśve devā aditiḥ pañca janāḥ | aditir jātam aditir janitvam iti* ||[3] *sa ya evam etām saṃhitām veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* || 15 ||[4]

[1] *Eva* B pr m [2] °*ditiḥ*° B. [3] = RV I, 89, 10 [4] 16 A, B Cf Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III, 1, 6.

*Jāyā pūrvarūpam patir uttararūpam putraḥ saṃhitā retaḥ saṃdhiḥ prajananam saṃdhānam iti Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ | saiṣā Prajāpatisaṃhitā | sa ya evam etām saṃhitām veda prajāyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* || 16 ||[1]

[1] 17 A B See Aitareya Āraṇyaka, III 1, 6, *Vienna Or Journ*, XVIII, 274

*Prajā pūrvarūpam śraddhottararūpam karma saṃhitā satyam saṃdhānam iti Kaśyapaḥ | saiṣā satyasaṃhitā*[1] *| tad āhur yat*[2] *satyasaṃdhā devā iti | sa ya evam etām saṃhitām veda saṃdhīyate prajayā paśubhir yaśasā brahmavarcasena svargeṇa lokena sarvam āyur eti* || 17 ||[3]

[1] *Satyam*° B pr m. The reference is not known to me The epithet is in Atharvaveda, VI, 6 19, 20. [2] *ya* B [3] 18 A, B Not in Aitareya Āraṇyaka.

*Vāk saṃhitetī Pañcālacaṇḍaḥ | vācā vai vedāḥ*[1] *saṃdhīyante*[2] *vācā chandāṃsi vācā mitrāṇi saṃdadhati | tad yat etad adhīte vā bhāṣate vā vāci tadā prāṇo bhavati vāk tadā prāṇam reḍhi*[3] *| atha yat etapiti vā tuṣṇīṃ vā bhavati prāṇe tadā vāg bhavati prāṇas tadā vācam reḍhi tāv anyo 'nyam reḍhaḥ | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam | ekaḥ suparṇaḥ sa samudram ā viveśa | sa idam viśvam bhuvanam vi caṣṭe | tam pākena*

*brahma kamarupi*[5] *kamacari bhavati evam hava sa sarvesu bhutesu kāmarupi kamacari bhavati ya evam veda ya evam veda* ‖ 22 ‖[6]

‖ *Ity Āranyake saptamo 'dhyāyah* ‖

[1] So A B sec m *laukikyah* pr m, but cf. Weber *Catal*, II 6 [2] *kena ca* B marg [3] = RV, X 125 3 [4] °*nti* B [5] *rupi* A corr in B But the masc of B may be a *constructio ad sensum* [6] 23 A B Not in Aitareya Aranyaka

## Adhyāya VIII

*Om* | *prano vamsa iti ha smaha Sthavirah Sakalyah* | *tad yatha śālavamśe sarve nye vanśāh samahitah syur evam evaitasmin prane sarva atma samahitah* | *tasyaitasyatmanah prana usmarupam asthini sparśarupam majjanah*[1] *svararupam mamsam lohitam ity etac caturtham aksararupam iti* | *trayam tv eva na etat proktam iti ha smaha Hrasvo Mandukeyah* | *tasyaitasya trayasya trimśah*[2] *sasti satani bhavanti samdhivam trivitas*[3] *tani saptavimśatisatani bhavanti saptavim satisatani samvatsarasyahoratranam tat samvatsarasyahoratrany apnoti* | *sa esa samvatsarasammānas caksurmayah śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vanmaya atmā* | *sa ya evam etam samvatsarasammānam caksurmayam śrotramayam chandomayam manomayam vānmayam*[3] *atmanam veda samvatsarasya sayujyam salokatam sarupatam sabhaksatam aśnute putri pasuman bhavati sarvam ayur eti ya rumkeyo vedayam cakre* ‖ 1 ‖[4]

[1] *h* om B [2] *tr vitas* B [3] *vā maya* B corrected into °*mayam* [4] See Aitareya Aranyaka III 2 1

*Atha Kauntharavyah* | *trini sastisatany aksaranam trini sastisatany usmanam*[1] *trini sastiśatani samdhinam* | *yany aksarany avocamahani tani yan*[2] *usmano ratrayas*[3] *ta*[4] *yan samdhin avocamahoratranam te samdhayah* | *ity adhidaivatam* | *atha dhyātmam* | *yāny aksarāny adhidaivatam avocamasthini tāny adhyātmam* | *yan*[5] *usmano dhidaivatam avocama majja as te dhyatmam* | *esa u ha vai sampratiprano yan majjatad reto na va rte*[6] *pranad retasah siddhir asti yad va rte*[6] *pranād retah sicyet tat pryen na sambhavet* | *yan samdhin adhidaivatam avocama parvani tany adhyatmam* | *tasyaitasya asthivam*[7] *majjñam parvanam iti pancaśaś catvarimśacchatani bhavanti samdhinam pañcetas tad aśitisahasram bhavaty aśitisahasram varkalino*[8] *brhatir ahar ahani sampadayanti* | *sa eso hahsammanaś caksurmayah śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vai maya atma* | *sa ya evam etad ahahsammanam caksurmayam śrotramayam*[9] *chandomayam manomayam vai mayam atmanam vedahnam sayujyam salokatam sarupatam sabhaksatam aśnute putri paśuman bhavati sarvam ayur eti* ‖ 2 ‖[10]

[1] *usna* m B pr m [2] *yany usn an no* B pr m [3] *ratriyas* B corr [4] *ta* : B pr m [5] *yany* : *s*° B pr m [6] *rteh* B [7] Read probably *tasyaitasya[trayasy]-āsthnam* &c. as in Aitareya Aranyaka III 2 2 [8] *bāskal'no* B pr m. corr to *barkali io* which is clearly = A's *varkal no* for *va(s)arkalino* as in Aitareya Āranyaka III 2 2 Weber *Catal* II 6 takes it as a proper name The form is unique [9] Om B pr m [10] See Aitareya Āranyaka III 2 2

*Catvārah puruṣa iti Vātsyah | śarīrapuruṣaś chandopuruṣo vedapuruṣo mahā puruṣa iti | śarīrapuruṣa iti yam avocāma ya evāyam daihika ātmā | tasyaitasya yo 'yam aśarīrah prajñātmā*[1] *sa rasah | chandahpuruṣa iti yam avocāma yena vedān veda Ṛgvedam Yajurvedam Sāmavedam iti | tasyaitasya brahma rasas tasmād brahmiṣṭham brāhmaṇam ṛtvijam kurvīta yo yajñasyolbaṇam*[2] *vidyāt | mahāpuruṣa iti yam avocāma samvatsara eva | tasyaitasyāsāv*[3] *āditya rasah | sa yaś cāyam aśarīrah prajñātmā yaś cāsāv āditya ekam etad iti vidyāt | tad etad ṛcābhyu ditam* ‖ 3 ‖[4]

[1] *aśarīraprajñātmā* B   [2] °*odbalam* (?) B pr m   [3] *asy* om. B.   [4] See Aitareya Aranyaka III, 2, 3

*Citram devānām ud agād anīkam | cakṣur Mitrasya Varuṇasyāgneh | āprā dyāvāpṛthivī antarikṣam | sūrya ātmā jagatas tasthuṣaś ceti* ‖[1] *etam evānuvidham samhitam samdhīyamānam manya*[2] *iti ha smāha Vātsyah | etam u haiva bahvṛcā mahad*[3]*ukthe mīmāmsanta etam agnāv adhvaryava etam mahāvrate chandogā etam asyām etam antarikṣa etam divy etam agnāv etam vāyāv etam candramasy etam nakṣatreṣv etam apsv etam oṣadhīṣv etam sarveṣu bhūteṣv etam akṣareṣv eva*[4] *brahmety upāsate | tad etad ṛcābhyuditam* ‖ 4 ‖[5]

[1] = RV I 115 1   [2] *manyata* A B   [3] *maha* only B. The *dukthe* are supplied from A, and Aitareya Aranyaka III 2 3 and are added in B in marg   [4] *etam* B sec. m
[5] See Aitareya Aranyaka, III, 2, 3

*Ud vayam tamasas pari | jyotis paśyanta uttaram | devam devatrā sūryam | aganma jyotir uttamam iti* ‖[1] *sa eṣo 'kṣarasammanaś cakṣurmayah śrotramayaś chandomayo manomayo vāṅmaya ātmā | sa ya evam etam akṣarasammanam cakṣurmayam*[2] *śrotramayam chandomayam manomayam vāṅmayam ātmānam parasmai śamsati dugdhadoha*[3] *asya vedā bhavanty abhāgo vāci bhavaty abhāgo nūkte*[4] *| tad etad ṛcābhyuditam* ‖ 5 ‖[5]

[1] = RV, I 50 10   [2] *bis* B pr m   [3] *dugdha*° B   [4] *nakteke* B pr m *nāke* B sec. m. *nukte* must be right B has °*bhogo*   [5] See Aitareya Aranyaka III, 2 3, 4

*Yas tityāja sacividam sakhāyam | na tasya vācy api bhāgo asti | yad īm śṛṇoty alakam śṛṇoti*[1] *| na hi praveda sukṛtasya panthām iti* ‖[2] *nāsyānūkte vāco bhāgo astīty eva tad āha | tan na*[3] *parasma evid ahah śamsen nagnim cinuyān na mahāvratena stuyan naitad ātmano 'pi kuryā*[4] *iti | sa yaś cāyam aśarīrah prajñātmā yaś cāsāv āditya ekam etad ity avocāma tau yatra viprādṛśyete* ‖ 6 ‖[5]

[1] *śṛnoma* B.   [2] = RV X, 71, 6   [3] *nah* B.   [4] *kuya* B.   [5] See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2 4.

*Candramā ivādityo dṛśyate na raśmayah prādurbhavanti lohinī dyaur bhavati yathā mañjiṣṭhā vyastah pāyur bhavati sampareto syātmā na ciram iva jīviṣyatīti*[1] *vidyāt | sa yat karaṇīyam manyeta tat kuryāt | athāpy ādarśe vodake vā jihmaśirasam*

*vāśirasam vatmānam paśyen na vā paśyet*[1] *tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidrā chāya bhavati na vā bhavati tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi chidra ivādityo rathanabhir ivākhyāyeta*[2] *tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi nila ivagnir dṛśyeta*[4] *yathā mayuragrīva mahāmeghe vā marīcir iva paśyed anabhre vā vidyutam paśyet abhra enām na paśyet tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpy apidhāyākṣiṇī upekseta yatraitad varalakāniva na paśyet tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpy*[6] *apidhāya karṇā upāsīta ya eso 'gner iva jvalataḥ śabdo rathasyevopabdis tam na*[7] *yada śṛṇuyāt tad apy evam eva vidyāt | athāpi viparyaste kaninike dṛśyete dvipithme*[8] *vā na vā dṛśyete tad apy evam eva vidyāt | sa yo 'to 'śruto 'mato 'vijñato 'drsto 'nādisto 'ghustah śrota mantā vijñata drastadeṣṭā ghoṣṭā sarveṣām bhūtānām antara*[9]*purusaḥ sa ma ātmeti vidyāt | sa utkrāmann evaitam aśariram prajñatmānam abhisampadyate vyahatitaram daihikam | saisā sarvasyai vaca upaniṣat sarva haivemah sarvasyai vāca upaniṣada imam tv evam*[10] *acaksate* || 7 ||[11]

[1] *jivisyati* B  [2] *paśyetad* B  [3] *khyayet* B pr m , text sec m , A , *iva* B  [4] *driyate* B. [5] *iva* B clearly, cf XI, 3 n 2  [6] Here in the MS a new page, f 65, has taken the place of the original leaf of the MS It is, however, in an old hand.  [7] *tatra* B, but *na* is implied in the abbreviated version of XI, 3 below, and inserted in Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 4  [8] °*pikve* A  [9] °*rah* A  [10] *ity* add A  [11] Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 4, 5.

*Pṛthivyā rūpam sparśa antariksasyoṣmāno divah svarāh | Agne rūpaṃ sparśā Vayor ūsmana Ādityasya svarāh | Ṛgvedasya rupaṃ sparśā Yajurvedasyosmānah Samavedasya svarāh | rathantarasya rūpam sparśa Vāmadevyasy*[1]*osmano bṛhatah svarāḥ | pranasya rupam sparśa apanasyosmaṇo vyanasya svarah | pranasya rūpam sparśā apanasyosmano manasah svarah | prānasya rūpam sparśa apanasyosmaṇa udanasya svarāh svarā iti Punardattaḥ | esa u haiva sarvām vācam veda ya evam veda* || 8 ||[2]

[1] °*deva*° B.  [2] See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5

*Atha khalv iyam daivī vīnā bhavati tada*[1]*nukṛtir asau manusi viṇā bhavati | tad yatheyam śastravatī tardmavatī bhavaty evam evāsau śastravatī tardmavatī bhavati | tad yathasyah śira evam amusyaḥ śiraḥ | tad yathasyai vamśa evam amusyā dandah | tad yathasyā udaram evam amusya ambhaṇim | tad yathāsyai mukhanasike akṣini ity*[2] *evam amusyaś chidrāni | tad yathasyā angulimgrahā upastaranāmity evam amuṣyāh parvani*[3] *| tad yathāsya aṅgulaya evam amuṣyās tantrayaḥ | tad yathāsyai jihvaivam amusyā vādanam | tad yathāsyāh svara evam amusyāḥ svaraḥ | tad yathā haiveyam romaśena carmanāpihitā bhavaty evam evāsau romaśena carmanāpihitā bhavati | romaśena ha sma carmaṇā purā viṇā apidadhati | saisa daivi viṇā bhavati | sa ya evam etam daivām vinām veda śrutavadaivatamo*[4] *bhavati bhūmiprasya*[5] *kirtir bhav iti*[6] *suśrūsante*[7] *hāsya parṣatsu*

*bhāṣyamāṇasyedam astu yad ayam īhate yatrāryā vāg vadati*[8] *vidur enam tatra* ‖ 9 ‖[9]

[1] From f. 66 on the old hand resumes [2] *akṣiṇīty* B sec. m. [3] *sarvāṇi* A. [4] °*vadanantamo* B. [5] *bhumim*° A, B. [6] *bhati* B pr. m. [7] *suśrusante* B. [8] *vadanti* B. *vācam* may be read, but see Śatapatha Brahmana, III, 2, 3, 15. [9] See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 5.

*Athātas Tāṇḍavindasya*[1] *vacaḥ* । *tad yatheyam akuśalena vadayitrā vīṇārabdhā na kṛtsnaṃ vīṇārthaṃ sādhayaty evam evākuśalena vaktrā vāg ārabdhā na kṛtsnaṃ vāgarthaṃ sādhayati* । *tad yathā haiveyaṃ kuśalena vādayitrā vīṇārabdhā kṛtsnaṃ vīṇārthaṃ sādhayaty evam eva kuśalena vaktrā vāg ārabdhā kṛtsnaṃ vāgarthaṃ sādhayati* । *tasyai vā etasyai vīṇāyai yā tviṣiḥ sā saṃhitetī Kātyāyanīputro Jātūkarṇyaḥ* । *atha ha smaitat Kṛtsnahārito*[2] *brāhmaṇam evodāharati* ‖ 10 ‖[3]

[1] °*vindavasya* B pr. m. [2] So A, B, and Weber, *Catal.*, II, 6. It is very probably an error for *Kṛṣṇa*°, Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6. [3] See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6.

*Prajāpatiḥ prajāḥ sṛṣṭvā vyasraṃsata sa chandobhir ātmānaṃ samadadhāt*[1] । *tad yac chandobhir ātmānaṃ samadadhāt*[1] *tasmāt saṃhitā* । *tasyai vā etasyai saṃhitāyai ṇakāro balaṃ ṣakāraḥ prāṇa ātmā saṃhitā* । *yaisā*[2] *kṣudramiśrā vikṛtis tāni nakhāni romāṇi vyañjanānīti* । *sa yo 'tra vicikitset saṇakāram eva brūyād ṛte ṇakāram iti saṇakāram eva brūyāt* । *evam eva yo 'tra vicikitset sasakāram eva brūyād ṛte sakāram*[3] *iti sasakāram eva brūyāt* । *tau vā etau ṇakārasakārau vidvān anusaṃhitam ṛco 'dhīyītāyuṣyam iti vidyāt* । *evam eva vidyāt* । *atha vāg itihāsapurāṇam*[4] *yac cānyat kiṃcid brāhmī kṛtyevādhīyīta tad apy evam eva vidyāt* । *te yad vayam anusaṃhitam ṛco dhīmahe yac ca Māṇḍukeyīyam adhyāyam prabrūmas tena no ṇakāraṣakārā upāptāv iti ha smāha Hrasvo Māṇḍūkeyaḥ* । *atha yad vayam anusaṃhitam ṛco 'dhīmahe yac ca svādhyāyam adhīmahe tena no ṇakārasakārā upāptāv iti ha smāha Sthaviraḥ Śākalyaḥ* । *etad*[5] *ha sma vai tad vidvāṃsa āhuḥ Kāvaṣeyāḥ*[6] *kimarthā vayam yakṣyāmahe*[7] *kimarthā vayam adhyeṣyāmahe vāci hi prāṇaṃ juhumaḥ prāṇe vācaṃ yo hy eva prabhavaḥ sa evāpyaya iti* । *tā etāḥ saṃhitā nānantevāsine brūyān nāsaṃvatsaravāsine*[8] *nābrahmacāriṇe nāvedavide nāpavaktra ity ācāryā ity ācāryāḥ* ‖ 11 ‖[9]

‖ *Ity Araṇyake 'ṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ* ‖

[1] So A, B [2] *athaisā* A [3] *nakaram* A, B [4] *itihasa*° B Both the MSS. have *brahmī*. Read perhaps *brahmi kṣatry evadhīyīta* [5] *ta* add B sec. m. [6] °*kavarṣeyaḥ* B sec. m. [7] *vakṣyamahe* B pr. m., and for *apyayaḥ* below, *avyayaḥ*. [8] *va* add B pr. m. [9] See Aitareya Āranyaka, III, 2, 6

ADHYĀYA IX.

*Om* । *tat Savitur vṛṇīmahe* । *vayam devasya bhojanam* । *śreṣṭhaṃ sarvadhātamam* । *turam bhagasya dhīmahi* ‖

*tat Savitur vareṇyam* । *bhargo devasya dhīmahi* ।
*dhiyo*[1] *yo naḥ pracodayāt* ‖

*adabdham mana isiram caksuh | suryo jyotiṣam śrestho dikṣe mā mā himsih* ‖ 1 ‖[1]

[1] *dhiyo* B see RV V 82 1 III 62 10   [2] Cf VII 1

*Yo ha vai jyeṣṭham ca śrestham ca veda jyesthaś ca ha vai śresthaś ca svānām bhavati | prano vai jyesthaś ca śreṣthaś ca | yo ha vai vasisthām veda vasistho ha svanam bhavati vag vai vasiṣṭha | yo ha vai pratistham veda prati ha tisthaty asmimś ca[1] loke musminś ca[2] cakṣur ha pratistha | yo ha vai sampadam veda sam hasmai kamah sampadyante srotram ha va u sampat | yo ha vā ayatanam vedayatano ha svanam bhavati mano va ayatanam | atha hemā devatah Prajapatim pitaram etyabruvan ko vai nah[3] śrestha iti | sa hovaca Prajapatir yasmin va utkrante śariram papistham iva manyeta sa vai śrestha iti* ‖ 2 ‖[4]

[1] *prati ha* and *asmim* B   [2] *ca* add B sec m   [3] *na* B.   [4] I have kept this enumeration though 1 (like VII 1) is merely a Śanti as it is followed in the MS See Chāndogya Upanisad V 1 1–7 which has a parallel version with the better reading *prati ha ti thati*

*Sa ha vag uccakrama | yatha mukā avadantah pranantah prānena paśyantaś caksusa śrnvantah śrotrena dhyayanto manasaivam iti* ‖ 3 ‖

*Caksur hoccakrama yathandha apaśyantah pranantah pranena vadanto vacā śrnvantah śrotrena dhyayanto manasaivam iti* ‖ 4 ‖

*Śrotram hoccakrama | yatha badhira aśrnvantah pranantah pranena vadanto vaca paśyantah caksusa dhyayanto manasaivam iti* ‖ 5 ‖

*Mano hoccakrama | yatha balā amanasah pranantah pranena vadantah vaca paśyantaś caksusa śrnvantah śrotrenaivam iti* ‖ 6 ‖

*Prano hoccakrama | tatas tad yatheha saindhavah suhayah padbīśaśankun samkhided evam asya prānān samakhidat[1] | te ha sametyocur[2] bhagavan motkramir iti | sa hovaca pranah kim ma[3] annam bhavisyat iti | yat kimcaśvabhya ā śakunibhya iti | kim me vaso bhavisyatiti apa iti hocuh | tasmad va ayam aśisyan[4] purastac coparistac cadbhih paridadhāti | lambhuko[5] hasya vaso bhavaty anagno hi bhavati | tad ha smaitat Satyakamo[6] Jabalo Gośruta[7] vaiyaghrapadyāyoktvovaca | apy evam śuṣkasya sthanoh prabruyaj jayerann asya śakhah[8] praroheyuh palaśaniti | vanaspate śatavalśo viroheti dyam ma lesir antariksam ma ma himsir iti ha Yājña valkyah*[9] ‖ 7 ‖

[1] *i* om B sec m Above it has *sama*°   [2] °*i cur* B   [3] *kima* and no *iti* B   [4] *aśisya* B and *pari dadhati* as in Chandogya Upanisad V 2 2   [5] *lumbhuko* B pr m *lambuko* B sec. m   [6] *anagnau* B For a similar error (*ai* for *e*) cf IX 8 n 4 X, 3 n. 1 These are due to the older mode of denoting the diphthongs   [6] *eva* (?) add B.   [7] In Chandogya Upanisad, V 2 1 sq which is parallel to this passage there is *Gośrutaye* which may well be read here.   [8] *śāsichā ah* B pr m *śakhāh* B sec m   [9] See Vājasaneyi Samhita (which is here cited in terms) V 43 where for *le ir* is *lekhīr* r and *kh* interchange passim in MS and I prefer *le r* (√*li* = √*ris*) Also *ma* is only once used in *antarik am* &c. Probably it is here a dittograph

*Atha yadi mahaj[1] jigamiset trirātram dīksitva[2] mavāsyāyām sarvausadasya mantham dadhimadhubhyām upamanthyāgnim upasamadhaya parisamuhya paristirya paryuksya daksinam janv acyottarato 'gneh kamse mantham krtva hutva homan manthe sampatam anayet | jyesthāya śresthaya svahety agnau hutva manthe[3] sampatam anayet | pratisthayai svāhety agnau hutvā manthe sampātam anayet | sampade svāhety agnau hutva manthe sampatam ānayet | tat Savitur varenyam iti pacchah pratya tat Savitur vrnimaha iti paccha acāmati mahavyāhrtibhiś caturtham nirnijya[4] kamsyam carmam vā sthandile vā samviśati | sa yadi striyam paśyet samrddham karmeti vidyāt samrddham karmeti vidyat* || 8 ||

|| *Ity Aranyake navamo 'dhyāyah* ||

[1] *yadi mahamiset* B pr m, text marg [2] *diksitva* B [3] *mantham* B A has *jyaisthāya śraisthyaya* [4] *nirnaijya* B possibly an error (cf XI, 3, n 1) for *nirnejya*, an irregular strong gerund (cf Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 992 b) The parallel, Chandogya, V, 2, 8, has *nirnijya* The words *mahavyahrtibhiś caturtham* (°*im* B) no doubt mean 'accompanying the fourth act with the three words *bhur bhuvas svar*', as would be needed in the case of the first RV verse, which has only three Padas

## ADHYĀYA X.

*Om | athato 'dhyatmikam āntaram agnihotram ity ācaksate | eta ha vai devatah purusa eva pratisthita agnir vaci vayuh prana adityaś caksusi[1] candrama manasi diśah śrotra apo retasi | tāsu hai vai sarvasu hutam bhavati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati casayati ca payayati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* || 1 ||

[1] *caksusi* B

*Sa trpto vacam tarpayati vak trptagnim tarpayaty agnis trptah prthivim tarpayati prthivi trpta yat kimcit prthivyaptthitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhutam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati casayati ca payayati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* || 2 ||

*Sa trptah pranam tarpayati pranas trpto vayum tarpayati vayus trpta akaśam tarpayaty akaśas trpto yat kimcakaśenapthitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati casayati ca payayati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* || 3 ||

*Sa trptas caksus tarpayati caksus trptam adityam tarpayaty adityas trpto divam tarpayati dyaus trpta yat kimcid divāptthitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhūtam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | so 'snati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* || 4 ||

*Sa trpto manas tarpayati manas trptam candramasam tarpayati candramas trpto naksatrani tarpayati naksatrani trptani masams tarpayanti masas trptā ardhamasams tarpayanty ardhamasas trpta ahoratre tarpayanty ahoratre trpte rtums*

*tarpayata*[1] *rtavas trptah samvatsaram tarpayanti samvatsaras trpto yat kimcid samvatsarenapihitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhutam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* ‖ 5 ‖

[1] *tarpayati* B.

*Sa trptah śrotram tarpayati śrotram trptam diśas tarpayati diśas trpta avantara diśas tarpayanty avantaradiśas trpta yat kimcavantaradigbhir apihitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhutam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | so 'śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* ‖ 6 ‖

*Sa trpto retas tarpayati retas trptam apas tarpayaty apas trpta nadims tarpayanti nadyah trptāh samudram tarpayanti samudro trpto yat kimcit samudrenāpihitam | bhavad bhavisyad bhutam tat sarvam tarpayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | so śnati sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati* ‖ 7 ‖

*Sa trptas tad etad vairajam daśavidham agnihotram bhavati | tasya prāna evahavaniyo pano garhapatyo vyano nvaharyapacano mano dhumo manyur arcir danta angarah śraddha payo vak samit satyam ahutih prajnatma sa rasah*[1] | *tad etad vairajam dasavidham agnihotram hutam bhavati | rohobhyam rohobhyam abhyarulham*[2] *abhi svargam lokam gamayati ya evam vidvan aśnati ca pibati caśayati ca payayati ca | atha ya idam avidvan agnihotram juhoti yathangaran*[3] *apohya bhasmani hutam tadrk tasyas tadrk tat syat*[4] ‖ 8 ‖[5]

‖ *Ity Aranyake daśamo dhyayah* ‖

[1] *prajnatm ah* B *sa* om A [2] So A *°rulham* B [3] *yatha ang°* B
[4] *tadrk tasya tadrk tasyat* B [5] For X 2 8 cf Chandogya Upanisad V 19-24

## ADHYAYA XI

*Prajapatir va imam purusam udañcat*[1] | *tasminn etā devatā aveśayad vācy agnim prane vayum apane vidyuta udane parjanyam caksusy adityam manasi candramasam śrotre diśah śarire prthivim retasy apo bala indram manyav iśanam m rdhany akaśam atmani brahma | sa yatha mahān amrtakumbhah*[2] *pinvamānas tisthed evam haiva sa tasthau | atha hema devata iksam cakrire kim ayam asmabhih purusah*[3] *karisyati kim va vayam*[4] *anena | hantasmāc charirad utkramameti | ta hoccakramuh | atha hedam śariram riktam iva pariśusiram*[5] | *sa heksam cakre Prajapati randhraya na ksamam*[6] *hantaham ima aśanayapipasabhyām upasrjā iti | ta hopasasrje*[7] | *ta hopasr tah*[8] *sukham alabhamāna imam eva purusam punah pratyavivisuh* ‖ 1 ‖

[1] *adancata* A B and cf Weber *Catal.*, II 6 text Cowell s MS B [2] *amrtah* B a common error e g XI 4 n 2 The reference is to the swell ng of the Soma. [3] *kim* ins. B pr m [4] *mayam* B pr m corr marg [5] So B from √*śus* and affix *ira* (cf Whitney *Sanskrit Grammar* § 1188 e) [6] *mak am* A B. I take *śariram* as the subject. *na bhaksam* (*n* for *bh*) is still easier to conjecture but is less plausible [7] *opa rje* B. For the perf cf Brhadaranyaka Upanisad, I 5 21 VI 4 2 [8] *°ti* B.

*Vāṅ mametyagnir avivesa | prāṇo mameti vāyur aviveśa | apāno mameti vidyuta*[1] *aviviśuḥ | udāno mameti parjanya āviveśa | cakṣur mamety āditya aviveśa | mano mameti candramā aviveśa | śrotram asmākam iti diśa aviviśuḥ | śarīram mameti pṛthivy aviveśa | reto 'smākam ity āpa aviviśuḥ | balam mamendra aviveśa | manyur mameśāna aviveśa | mūrdhā mamety ākāśa aviveśa | ātmā mameti brahmāviveśa | sa yathā mahān vṛkṣa ūrdhva upasiktamūlas tiṣṭhed evam haiva sa tasthau* || 2 ||

[1] *vidyuta* B *vaid°* A (as in XI, 1), but *aviveśa* The verb is clearly wrong cf XI 5

*Athāyam puruṣaḥ praiṣyan*[1] *purā saṃvatsarāt saṃvatsarasya dṛṣṭīḥ paśyati | chidrā chāyā bhavati na vā bhavati | mahāmeghe vā marīcir iva paśyed anabhre vā vidyutam paśyed abhra enam na paśyet | akṣiṇī vā apidhāya varaṭakānīva na paśyati | karṇau vāpidhāyopabdim iva na śṛṇoti | nāsmiṃl loke ramate nainam manaś chandayati*[2] *| iti pratyakṣadarśanāni* || 3 ||

[1] *praiṣyan* B read perhaps the usual *preṣyan* cf Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 320 321 and IX 8, n 4 A has *vidyutah* below [1] *baraṭikān* B, see VIII 7, n 5, which passage is parallel [2] *°chandayati* B

*Atha svapnaḥ | puruṣam kṛṣṇam kṛṣṇadantam paśyati sa enam hanti varāha enam hanti markaṭa enam hanti bisāni khādayati suvarṇam bhakṣayitvā*[1]*vagiraty ekapauṇḍarīkam*[2] *dhārayati gāṃ savatsām dakṣiṇāmukho naladamālī vrajayati | sa ya eteṣām kiṃcit*[3] *paśyet pāṇḍurādarśanam kālīm*[4] *striyam muktakeśām muṇḍam tailābhyaṅgam*[5] *kausumbhaprāvṛtadhanam gṛdany uṣṭrārohaṇam dakṣiṇāśagamanādīni*[6] *vīkṣyopoṣya pāyasam sthālīpākam śrapayitvā sarūpavatsāyā goḥ payasi na tv eva tu kṛṣṇāyā agnim upasamādhāya parisamuhya paristīrya paryukṣya dakṣiṇam jānv acya sruveṇājyāhutīr juhoti* || 4 ||[7]

[1] *bhakṣitvā* B corr in marg to *bhakṣay°* [2] *ekaḥ* A B [3] *kaṃ cit* corr in B, but see Aitareya Āraṇyaka III 2 4. [4] *kālīm* B [5] *°bhyaṅgaḥ* A B Or *tailābhyaṅgakau s°* may be read. [6] Text doubtful B has *dakṣiṇāgamanādīni* the intermediate letters are obscure and have been corrected in a later hand A has *°aśa°* [7] See VIII 7

*Vāci me gniḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | prāṇe me vāyuḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | apāne me vidyutaḥ*[1] *pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | udāne me parjanyaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | cakṣuṣi ma ādityaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | manasi me candramāḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | śrotre me diśaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | śarīre me pṛthivī pratiṣṭhitā svāhā | retasi ma āpaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | bale ma indraḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | manyau ma īśānaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | mūrdhani ma ākāśaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ svāhā | ātmani me brahma pratiṣṭhitam svāheti | athaitad ajyāvaśeṣam sthālīpāke samavanīya*[2] *sthālīpākasyo paghātam juhoti* || 5 ||

[1] *vaidyutaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ* A [2] *naya* B The root is *samavanī*

*Vāci me gniḥ pratiṣṭhito vāg hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani tat satyam devānām*

*maham*[1] *akāmo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | prane me vayuh pratisthito prano hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | apane me vidyutah pratisthita*[2] *apano hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | udane me parjanyah pratisthita udanam hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | caksusi ma adityah pratisthitas caksur hrdaye hrdayam*[3] *atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | manasi me candramah pratisthito mano hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | śrotre me diśah pratisthita diso hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svahā | śarire me prthivi pratisthita prthivi hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | bale ma indrah pratisthito balam hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | manyau ma isanah pratisthito manyur hrdaye hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | murdhani ma akaśah pratisthito murdha hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | atmani me brahma pratisthitam atma hrdaye*[4] *hrdayam atmani tat satyam devanam maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaheti | athaital sthalipakasesam atmani samavaninya juhoti* || 6 ||

[1] So clearly A B [2] *vai°* A *pratisthito* A, B [3] Henceforth the scribe of B abbreviates to *hrdaye hā* [4] Even here the abbreviation is meant

*Aśmā jāgatam ayas traistubham loham ausniham sisam kakubham rajatam svarajyam suvarnam gayatram annam vairajam*[1] *trptir anustubham nakam samrajyam Brhaspatir barhatam Brahma panktam Prajapatir atichandasam Savitri sarvavedachandasena chandaseti* || 7 ||

[1] °*rajyam* B.

*Asmeva sthiro vasani jagatena chandasa | puruso manih pranah sutram annam granthis tad granthim udgrathaniy*[1] *annakamah*[2] *| mrtyave brahmanam apa sarvam ayur aśyayusman maham akamo marisyamy annavan annado bhuyasam svaha | aya*[3] *iva sthiro vasani traistubhena chandasa puruso manih pranah*[4] *svāha | loham iva sthiro vasany ausnihena chandasa puruso manih pranah svaha | sisam iva sthiro vasani kakubhena chandasa puruso manih pranah svaha | rajatam iva sthiro vasani svārajyena chandasa puruso manih pranah svāhā | suvarnam iva sthiro vasani gāyatrena chandasā puruso manih pranah svaha | annam iva sthiro vasani vaira*

*yena candamā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | triṣṭir iva sthiro vasany ānuṣṭubhena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | nākam iva sthiro vasani sāmrājyena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | Bṛhaspatir iva sthiro vasani bārhatena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | Brahmeva sthiro vasani pāṅktena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | Prajāpatir iva sthiro vasani atichandasena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāhā | Savitrir*[4] *iva sthiro vasani sarvavedachandasena chandasā puruṣo maṇiḥ prāṇaḥ svāheti | priyāyai vā jāyāyai*[5] *priyāya vāntevāsine 'nyasmai vāpi yasmai kāmayeta tasmā ucchiṣṭam dadyāt | sa hāpi śatam varṣaṁ jīvati punaḥ punaḥ prayuñjāno*[7] *jīvaty eva jīvaty eva* || 8 ||

|| *Ity Āraṇyaka ekādaśo 'dhyāyaḥ* ||

[1] *udgrathanāny* B  [2] *ka* B pr m, *kāmo* B sec m  [3] *ya* B sec. m  [4] The scribe abbreviates henceforth to *pra svāhā*. I have so printed to save space.  [5] *savitrir* B pr m, °*trir* B sec m, °*triva* A. Possibly *savitri iva* with shortening may be meant (cf Macdonell *Sanskrit Grammar*, p 63, Wackernagel *Altindische Grammatik*, I, 311, 322)  [6] *jāyai* B pr m, corr in marg  [7] *prayujāno* B, is just possible

## Adhyāya XII

*Om | hastivarcasam prathatām bṛhadvayaḥ |*
*yad Adityai*[1] *tanvaḥ sambabhūva |*
*tan mahyam samaduḥ sarvam*[2] *ete |*
*Ādityāso Āditya*[3] *saṁvidānāḥ* || 1 ||

*yat te varco jātavedaḥ |*
*bṛhad bhavaty āhitam |*
*tena mā varcasā tvam |*
*Agne varcasvinam kuru* || 2 ||

*yac ca vāca vā puruṣe |*
*yac ca hastiṣv āhitam |*
*suvarṇe goṣu yad varcaḥ |*
*mayi tad hastivarcasam* || 3 ||

*yad akṣeṣu hiraṇyeṣu |*
*goṣv aśveṣu yad yaśaḥ |*
*surāyām pūyamānāyām |*
*mayi tad hastivarcasam* || 4 ||

*mayi bhargo mayi mahaḥ |*
*mayi yajñasya yad yaśaḥ |*

*tan mayi Prajāpatih* ı
*divi divam iva drmhatu* ‖ 5 ‖[4] ‖ 1 ‖[5]

[1] *ta* B pr m [2] *sarva* A, B sec. m as in Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1; cf Whitney's translation, pp 126, 127 This verse has on the whole better readings than the Atharvaveda. [3] *Adityāh* B [4] I have, for convenience, numbered the verses throughout. The text in the MS is only divided into sections. I have also printed the verses in Pādas without Sandhi [5] For ver 1, cf Atharvaveda, III, 22, 1, ver 2, cf ibid, III, 22, 4 and 3, vers 3, 4, cf ibid., XIV, 1, 35, VI, 69 1, ver 5, cf ibid, VI 69 3 (with *divi dyam iva drmhatu*), Sāmaveda, I, 603 (with *paramesthi* for *tan mayi*) B omits *divi*

*Aśvinā saraghena mā* ı
*sam anktām*[1] *madhuna payah* ı
*yathā madhumatīm vācam* ı
*āvadami janesu* ‖ 6 ‖
*ghrtād ullupto*[2] *madhumān payasvān* ı
*dhanamjayo dharuno dharayisnuh* ı
*rujan sapatnan*[3] *adharamś ca krnvan* ı
*a roha mam mahate saubhagāya* ‖ 7 ‖
*Prajapate na tvad etany anyah* ı
*viśva jatani pari ta babhuva* ı
*yatkamas te juhumas tan no astu* ı
*vayam syama patayo rayinam* ‖ 8 ‖[4]
*ayam sano*[5] *nudatam me sapatnan* ı
*Indra iva Vrtram prtanasu salha* ı
*Agnir iva kaksam vibhrtah purutra* ı
*valesu nas tigmayambho 'nu marsti* ‖ 9 ‖
*ayam sano yo 'nuvādī kila* ı
*Indra*[6] *iva Vrtram vi puro ruroja* ı
*anenendro vi mrdho vihatya* ı
*śatruyatām a bhara bhojanāni* ‖ 10 ‖[7] ‖ 2 ‖

[1] *samahan* A, *sammahan* B. Presumably an imperative from √*mah*, trans, *Aśvinā* being voc The parallel, Atharvaveda, VI 69, 2 (=IX, 1 19), has *madhunanktam subhaspati*, and in the last Pada *avadani janah anu* which is better metre and syntax. I read °*anktam*, for synt cf *J R A S*, 1908, p 1124 [2] *urlupto* A, B Cf Atharvaveda, V, 28, 14, XIX, 33, 2, 46 6 Scheftelowitz, *Die Apokryphen des Rgveda*, p 118, ver 9 a, below, ver 34 [3] *sapat nad* B [4] =RV, X 121 10 and see Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*, p 612, below, ver 35 [5] *sa yo* B [6] *kila* (*kila* A) *iva* only A, B The parallel with *Indra* above seems conclusive In both cases *Indreva* (or *Indro va*) must be read *metri causa* B has *viduro* corrected to *viro* [7] Last line=RV, V 4, 5, &c

*jayendra śatrun jahi śura dasyun* ı
*Vrtram hatva kuliśena vi vrśca*[1] ı

*augha iva śāpān*[1] *pra nudai sapatnan* |
*jahyāt sapatnān iiadhiir vaneva* || 11 ||

*anu vrśca madhyāt pra*[3] *vrścoparistat* |
*vi vrśca paścat prati śūra vrśca* |
*ivayā pranuttan maghavann amitran* |
*śūra*[4] *risantam Maruto 'nu yantu* || 12 ||

*tvam rudrair hetibhih pinvamānah* |
*Indram manvānā Maruto juṣanta* |
*suparnaḥ kaṅkāh pra mrśantv enan* |
*mahyatam damstri vardhanesu* || 13 ||

*brahmanuttasya maghavan pritayatah* |
*vivag*[5] *Indra bhangāh patantu* |
*ma jñātaram aśata mā*[6] *pratisthām* |
*mitho vighnanā upa yānti mrtyum* || 14 ||

*Agne yaśasvin yaśase sam arpaya* |
*Indravatim apacitim iha vaha* |
*ayam murdhā paramesthi suvarcah* |
*sajatanam uttamaśloko astu* || 15 ||[7] || 3 ||

[1] The metre requires °*śena vrśca*  [2] *śapat* B the word being no doubt misunderstood  [3] *pra vi* A, B, but not only this is bad metre (in no case is the metre good, but *an vrśca* may be read), but the *vi* following renders the double prefix most improbable  [4] *amitrāñ chure* A B, possibly for *sa rersa(n)tam*  [5] *viśak* A B  [6] So I read The verse is a mutilated version of Atharvaveda, VI, 32, 3 (= VIII, 8, 21) *ma jñataram ma pratistham vindanta* | *mitho vighnanā upa yantu mrtyum* See also Āśvalayana Gṛhya Sutra, III, 10, 11 *J A O S*, XXVI 227 B has *śatamāḥ, pratisṭhamaho vighnanām yati* A has *iho, vijñatām* The text is merely a conjecture  [7] Cf Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 3[4-6], ending *samanānam uttamah śloko astu* Either *sa yit*° or *sajat*° is possible, and *uttamaḥ śloko* or *uttamaśloko*

*bhadram paśyanta upa sedur agan* |
*tato dīksam rsayah svarvidah* |
*tataḥ ksatram balam ojaś ca jatam* |
*tad asmai deva abhi sam namantam* || 16 ||[1]

*dhata vidhata paramota samdrk* |
*Prajapatiḥ paramesthi suvarcah* |
*stomam chandamsi nivido ma ahuh* |
*etasmai rāstram abhi sam namantām* || 17 ||[2]

*abhy a vartadhvam upa sevatagnim* |
*ayam śastadhipatir no astu* |

*asya vijñānam anu sam rabhadhvam* |
*imam paścād anu jīvatha sarve* ‖ 18 ‖[3]

*alardo*[4] *nāma jato 'si* |
*pura sūryat purosasaḥ*[5] |
*tam tva sapatnakṣayanam*[6] |
*vedatho*[7] *vistambhayambhanam* ‖ 19 ‖

*nardhe pramyeta*[8] *tared*[9] *dvisantam* |
*kalpeta vakyam prtanaḥ saheta* |
*pramāyukam tasya dvisantam ahuḥ* |
*sramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 20 ‖ ‖ 4 ‖

[1] Cf Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 3, Taittiriya Āranyaka, III 11, 9 (with *pāśyanta*, *dgre*, and *tāpo*), Atharvaveda, XIX, 41 1, and Whitney's translation, p. 963 Cf p 349 A, B have *agān* and *palyema* [2] Cf Taittiriya Samhita, V, 7, 4 4 (with *virāja stómaḥ*, and *abhi sam namama*) A has *stonam* [3] Cf ibid., V, 7 4, 4, 5, with *upa mita sakām*, and *vo* (B has *mno*) [4] So A, B. The word may be connected with *aradu* or *aratu* Atharvaveda, XX, 131, 8 Cp p 349 [5] = Atharvaveda, X, 7, 31[b] [6] *sapatnakksapanam* B But *ksapanam* is too like *ksayanam* in MSS to render the reading doubtful [7] The metre is wrong and *veda* may belong to the line before, or *atho* be an interpolation. [8] *pramiye* B pr m. [9] *tare* B.

*na sa śaptam*[1] *aśnati na kilbisam krtam* |
*nainam divyo Varuṇo hanti bhutam* |
*nainam kruddham manyavo 'bhi yanti*[2] |
*sramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 21 ‖

*nasya tvacam himsati*[3] *jātavedaḥ* |
*na mamsam aśnati na hanti tanī* |
*śatayur asmiñ jaradastiḥ praiti* |
*srāmanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 22 ‖

*nasya praja dusyati jiyamanā* |
*na śailago*[4] *bhavati na papakrtya* |
*nanyan mithas tasya kulesu jayate* |
*sramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 23 ‖

*nasyāpavāda na pravādakā*[5] *grhe* |
*na sampatantyo*[6] *na viveśa tasmai* |
*nāsminn alakṣmiḥ kurute niveśanam* |
*srāmanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 24 ‖

*nainam rakṣo na piśāco hinasti* |
*na jambhako nipy asuro na yakṣaḥ* |

*na sūtikā tasya gṛheṣu*[7] *jāyate* |
  *iramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 25 ‖   ‖ 5 ‖

[1] *sam (?) suptam* A, B  [2] *abhimati*° A, B  [3] Probably *metri causa* (– ◡ ◡ after caesura) Cf ver 25[a], 26[b]  [4] *śailaka* B pr m , *śailago* A, B sec m  *bhavati* is disyllabic  Cf Hopkins's *Ancient Epic of India*, p 260, and for a similar case in the Aitareya Brahmana, my note, *J R A S*, 1908, p 102  [5] *pravataka* B  If *pravadaka* is right, the *ka* must add nothing to the word.  [6] *sampatatyo* B pr m , *tapo* sec. m  A has *vileta*  [7] *kulasya* A

*nainam vyāghro na vṛko na dvipī* |
  *na śvāpadam hiṃsati kiṃcanainam* |
*na hastinam kruddham upaiti bhītim*[1] |
  *iramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 26 ‖

*nainam sarpo na pṛdākur hinasti* |
  *na vṛściko na tiraścirājī*[2] |
*nainam kṛṣṇo* [3]*hir abhi*[3] *saṃhate* |
  *iramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 27 ‖

*nainam pramattam*[4] *Varuṇo hinasti* |
  *na makaro na grahaḥ śiśumāraḥ* |
*parāvarac chivam asmai kṛṇoti* |
  *iramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 28 ‖

*pramṛyukam asya dviṣantam āhuḥ* |
  *puṣpam iva chinnam saha bandhanena* |
*augha iva śapan pra nudat sapatnān* |
  *iramanim bailvam yo bibharti* ‖ 29 ‖

*ayam maṇiḥ pratisaro jambo jñaya badhyate* |
  *anenendro Vṛtram ahann ṛṣiṇa*[5] *ca maniṣiṇa* ‖ 30 ‖   ‖ 6 ‖

[1] *bhitam* A, B sec m  Cf *J A O S*, XXVIII, 390  [2] *tiraścinaraja* B, °*cina*° A  [3] *bhi* only A, B  The animal *kṛṣṇa* is doubtful (Atharvaveda XI 2, 2 is taken otherwise by Whitney in his translation), and the *kṛṣṇo hiḥ* is regular, hence I add *hir*  [4] °*yttam* B, see Aitareya Āranyaka, II, 1, 1, n 2  [5] *ṛṣina* B

*sahendra dviṣataḥ sahasvarāṇaḥ* |
  *sahasva pṛtanāyataḥ* |
*nāga iva pūrvapādābhyām* |
  *abhi tiṣṭha*[1] *pṛtanyataḥ* ‖ 31 ‖

*agad ayam bailvo maṇiḥ* |
  *sapatna*[2]*kṣayaṇo vṛṣa* |
*tam paśyanti kavayaḥ sarvavīrāḥ* |
  *yathā sapatnān samare sahiṣyuḥ*[3] ‖ 32 ‖

*amrtam me manau sutram Aśvinav api nahyatam* ।
*bailzah sahasravīryo 'si ma ie bharta rısam*[4] *aham* ॥ 33 ॥
*ghrtad ullupto*[5] *madhuman payasvan* ।
*dhanamjayo dharuno dharayısnuh* ।
*rujan sapatnan*[6] *adharams ca krnvan* ।
*a roha mam mahate saubhagaya* ॥ 34 ॥
*Prajapate na tvad etany anyah* ।
*visva jatani pari ta babhuva* ।
*yatkamas te juhumas tan no astu* ।
*vayam syama patayo rayinam* ॥ 35 ॥
*śasa itthaṁ mahaṅ asıtı pañca*[7] ॥ 7 ॥

[1] *stha* add B marg [2] *sapatnahkṣapaṇo* B Cf Atharvaveda I 29, 4, 6 [3] *isa heyah* B. [4] *rısam* B. B has *bilvah* [5] *ur* A *ulupto* B cf ver 7 [6] *sapatnad* B, cf ver 7 [7] i.e RV, X 152 1–5 giving in all forty verses Their use in the ritual (XII 8) is by verses 1 8 9 14 15 18 19, 20–35 36 40

*Athato mamkalpah* । *bhutikamah puspena triratroposito jīrato hastino dantan matram uddhrtyagnim upasamadhaya*[1] *parisamuhya paristirya paryuksya daksinam janv acyottarato 'gneh kamse manim krtva hutva homan manau sampatam anayet* । *hastivarcasam ity etabhih pratyrcam*[2] *astabhih saptarātram madhusarpisor vasayitva triratram ekam va badhniyad*[3] *ghrtad ullupto ity etayarca* । *ata evottaram sadbhir hrdayaśulagramanim pratodagramanim va muśalagramanim*[4] *vā khadira saramanim va mamsaudane vasayitva triratram ekam va badhniyat* । *ata evottaram catasrbhir vrsabha*[5]*śrngagramanim ghrtaudane vasayitva triratram ekam va badhniyat* । *ata evottaram ekayairandamanim tilaudane*[6] *vasayitvā triratram ekam va badhniyat* । *ata evottaram ṣolaśabhir*[7] *bailvam saptarātram madhusarpiṣor vāsayitva triratram ekam vā badhniyad ghrtad ullupta ity etayarcā* । *ata evottaram pañcabhir mahavarohasyodoham*[8] *mudgaudane vasayitva triratram ekam vā badhniyāc chaktau sati*[9] *prathamam hasticchāyāyam vayaghre vapi carmany asino vapi juhuyad asino vāpi juhuyat* ॥ 8 ॥

॥ *Ity Āraṇyake dvadaśo 'dhyayah* ॥

[1] *ūpa°* B [2] *pratrcam* B. [3] *badhniyad* B. [4] *muśala°* B, *mus°* A [5] *rsabhah* B [6] *°audanena* B. [7] *sodaśibhir* B. [8] *mahāvarahasod°* B. *o* in MSS is often confused with *a* cf Hoernle *Osteology* p 131 The name of a wood of sorts seems essential and *uduham* (a besom', cf Taittiriya Brahmana, III, 8, 4 3) may be meant The alternative is to take *udoham* as a gerund [9] *sati* B.

## ADHYAYA XIII

*Athato vairagyasamskrte śarire brahmayajñamstho bhavet* । *apa punarmrtyum jayati* । *tad u ha vaimā drastavyah śrota yo mantavyo nididhyāsitavya iti* । *tam etam*

*vedanuvacanena vividisanti brahmacaryena tapasa śraddhaya yajñenanaśakena ceti Mandukeyah* । *tasmad evamvic chanto*[1] *danta uparatas titiksuh śraddhavitto bhutval many evatmanam paśyed iti Mandavyah* । *yo yam vijñanamayah purusah pranesu sa esa neti nety atmavagrhya idam brahmedam ksatram*[2] *ime deva ime veda ime loka imani sarvani bhutanidam sarvam yad ayam atma* । *sa esa tat tvam asity atmavagamyo 'ham brahmasmiti* । *tad etad brahmapurvam aparam anaparam anantaram abahyam ayam atma brahma sarvanubhur ity anuśasanam iti Yajña valkyah*[3] । *tam etam naputraya nanantevasine bruyad iti* । *ya imam adbhih parigr. hitam vasumatim dhanasya purnam dadyad. idam eva tato bhuya idam eva tato bhuya ity anusasanam* ।[4] *tam*[5] *etam upanisadam vedaśiro na yatha katham cana vadet*[6] । *tad etad rcabhyuditam* ॥ १ ॥

॥ *Ity Aranyake trayodaśo 'dhyayah* ॥[7]

[1] *vichanto* A B [2] *ksatra* B. [3] This is an exact quotation save for the insertion of *aparam* of Bṛhadaranyaka Upanisad II 5 19 B pr m has *brahma* For the earlier part of that Upanisad, II 4 5, 6 IV, 4 25 27, 28 and for the next words VI 3 20 (13 Kanva)
[4] This is clearly an inaccurate reminiscence of Chandogya Upanisad III, 15 6 [5] *tav* B
[6] *vede* B [7] Simply ॥ 9 ॥ B but (*a*) this contradicts the colophon to XII 8, (*b*) there is no connexion with XII (*c*) A Weber's MS *Catal* II 6 has XIII Cf *J R A S* 1908, pp 380 381

## Adhyaya XIV

*rcam murdhanam yajusam uttamangam* ।
*samnam śiro tharvanam mundamundam* ।
*nadhite dhite vedam ahus tam ajñam* ।
*śiraś*[1] *chitvasau kurute kabandham* ॥ १ ॥[2]

*sthanur ayam bharaharah kilabhut* ।
*adhitya vedam na vijanati yo rtham* ।
*yo rthajña it sakalam bhadram asnute* ।
*nakam eti jñanavidhutapapma* ॥ २ ॥[3]

[1] *śira* B [2] The numbers are added by me [3] B ends with ॥ 10 ॥ Really Adhyaya XIV should be combined with Adhyaya XIII into one Adhyaya but the Berlin MS (Weber *Catal* II, 6) treats this as a separate Adhyaya For ver 2, see Nirukta I, 18 Burnell *Samhitopanisad Brāhmana* p 38

## Adhyaya XV

*Atha vamsah* । *om* । *namo brahmane nama acaryebhyah* । *Gunakhyac Chankha yanad asmabhir adhitam* । *Gunakhyah Śankhayanah Kaholat Kausitakeh* । *Kaholah Kausitakir Uddalakad*[1] *Aruneh* । *Uddalaka Arunih Priyavratat Saumapeh* । *Priya-vratah Saumāpih Somapat* । *Somapah Saumat Prativeśyat* । *Saumah Prativeśyah*[2] *Prativesyat* । *Prativeśyo Brhaddivat* । *Brhaddivah Sumnayoh* । *Sumnayur Uddalakat* ।

•

*Uddālako Viśvamanasah* | *Viśvamanā Vyaśvāt* | *Vyaśvah Sakamaśvat* | *Sakamaśvo Devarātat* | *Devarato Viśvāmitrat* | *Viśvamitra Indrat* | *Indrah Prajapateh* | *Prajapatir Brahmanah* | *Brahma Svayambhuh* | *namo brahmane namo brahmane* |

|| *Iti Āranyake pañcadaśo 'dhyāyah* ||[3]

|| *Iti Śankhāyanaranyakam samāptam* ||

[1] *Udalukad* B  [2] *Somah Prativelyah*, Winternitz, *Bodl Catal*, p 60 A has *Somapih* and *Somah*  [3] *ity Āranyake Upanisado ekadaśo 'dhyayah* | *iti Samkhayana Upanisadah samaptah* | *sampurnam* | *śrikanu śrisamvat* 1837 (=A D 1781) *varse miti jyesthaśudi* 15 *śukravā* B. But this is all on f 87, which is a recent restoration and is of no authority The number XV is given in the Berlin MS to the Vamśa, which ends *iti Śamkhayanaranyake pamcadaśo 'dhyayah* || *cha* || *samaptah* || *śubham bhavatu* || *svasti samvat* 1734 *varse asadhaśuddha* 13 *śanau abhyamtaranagarnyātaiyarajanagaramadhye* | *Rajapure vastavyam śrsakadiksitanamhamnaraghunatha* || *pamdyasimajinrsimhaputrapautrapathanartham* | The Vamśa clearly begins with the author of the Aranyaka i e Gunakhya, why Oldenberg (*S B E* XXIX 4 5) should think the author of the Sutras is meant I cannot understand See also my *Śankhayana Aranyaka*, p. 72

# INDEX I

## QUOTATIONS FROM RGVEDA.

(The first numbers in brackets denote the reference in the Samhitā The second, the page and column of Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* The *pratikas* are given exactly as in the Samhita text, except that the original forms *in pausa* are restored References marked Ś are to the Sankhāyana Āranyaka )

*Mitram huve pūtadakṣam* (I, 2, 7ᵃ), I, 1, 4 (713ᵇ) Padas ᵃ and ᵇ are cited.
*mo ṣu ṇa vaghatas cana* (VII, 32, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 4 (723ᵇ)

*yaanayat paravatah* (VI, 45, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (724ᵃ)
*ya Indra somapatamah* (VIII, 12, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (725ᵃ)
*ya eka id vidayate* (I, 84, 7ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (726ᵇ)
*yah satraha vicarsanih* (VI, 46, 3), V, 2, 4 (777ᵇ)
*yatra brahmī pavamanaḥ* (IX, 113, 6ᵃ), III, 2, 4 (741ᵇ)
*yad agna eṣā samitir bhavati* (X, 11, 8), V, 1, 1 (749ᵇ)
*yad anti yac ca durake* (IX, 67, 21), III, 2, 4 (751ᵃ)
*yad Indra prag apag udak* (VIII, 4, 1), V, 2, 4 (753ᵇ)
*yad Indraham yatha tvam* (VIII, 14, 1), V, 2, 5 (754ᵃ)
*yad vavana* (X, 74, 6ᵃ), V, 2, 2 (760ᵇ)
*yas tigmaśṛṅgo vṛṣabho na bhimah* (VII, 19, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 2 (770ᵇ)
*yas tityaja sacividam sakhayam* (X, 71, 6ᵃ), III, 2, 4 (770ᵇ, where the variant in TA is not noted), Ś VIII, 6 Verse cited in full
*yasya tyac chambaram made* (VI, 43 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (774ᵇ)
*ya Indra bhuja abharaḥ* (VIII, 97, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 4 (778ᵇ), Ś II 9
*yāvad dyāvāpṛthivi tavad it tat* (X, 114, 8ᵇ), I, 3 8 (786ᵃ)
*yavad brahma viṣṭhitam tāvati vāk* (X, 114, 8ᵈ), I, 3, 8 (786ᵃ)
*yo jāta eva prathamo manasvan* (II, 12, 1ᵃ), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (808ᵇ)
*yonis ta Indra sadane akāri* (VII, 24, 1ᵃ), V, 3, 5 (810ᵇ).
*yo rdya carsaninām* (VIII, 70, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 4 (812ᵇ)

*rathantaram a jabhara Vasiṣṭhaḥ* (X, 181, 1ᵈ), III, 1, 6 (817ᵇ).
*ratrīsukta* (X, 127, 1ᵃ), III, 2, 4 (823ᵇ).
*revatir naḥ sadhamadah* (I, 30, 13ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (830ᵇ).

*vane na va yo adhayi cakan* (X, 29, 1ᵃ), I, 5, 2, V, 3, 1 (837ᵃ)
*vayam gha tva sutavantaḥ* (VIII, 33, 1), V, 2, 4 (838ᵃ)
*vayav a yahi darśata* (I, 2, 1ᵃ), I, 1, 4 (860ᵃ) Padas ᵃ and ᵇ are cited.
*vartrahatyaya savase* (III, 37, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (863ᵃ)
*vavṛdhanaḥ śavasa bhuryojaḥ* (X, 120, 2ᵃ), I, 3, 4 (863ᵃ), Ś II, 1
*vidhum dadrāṇam samane bahūnam* (X, 55, 5ᵃ), V, 3, 1 (869ᵃ)
*viśoviśo vo atithim* (VIII, 74, 1ᵃ), I, 1, 1 (877ᵇ); Ś II, 2
*vaiśvanaraya dhiṣaṇām ṛtavṛdhe* (III, 2, 1ᵃ), I, 5, 3 (906ᵇ)

*sakhaya a śiṣamahi* (VIII, 24, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (951ᵇ)
*sanitah susanitar* (VIII, 46, 20ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (966ᵃ)
*samudhagnim* (VIII, 44, 1ᵃ), V, 1, 1 (980ᵇ)
*sahasradha pañcadaśany uktha* (X, 114, 8ᵃ), V, 3, 8 (1001ᵃ)
*suta it tvam nimiśla Indra some* (VI, 23, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 2 (1015ᵃ)
*surūpakṛtnum ūtaye* (I, 4, 1ᵃ), V, 2, 5 (1021ᵇ)
*sūrya ātmā jagatas* (I, 115, 1ᵈ), II, 2, 4, III, 2, 3 (1025ᵇ)
*svadasvah soma a yāhi* (VIII, 2, 28), V, 2, 3 (1054ᵇ).
*svadoḥ svadiyaḥ svaduna srja sam* (X, 120, 3ᵃ), I, 3, 4, V, 1, 6 (1055ᵃ)

*kastacyuti janayanta* (VII, 1, 1ᵇ), I, 1, 2 (1065ᵇ)
*hotājanisṭa cetanaḥ* (II, 5, 1ᵃ), I, 1, 1 (1072ᵇ)

In the Śānti verses (see Crit Note on I, 1) also occur[1] —

*abhiṣu naḥ* (IV, 31, 3ᵃ), (not in Bloomfield, 96ᵇ)
*avadams tvam śakune bhadram a vada* (II, 43, 3ᵃ), (not in Bloomfield 186ᵇ)
*kaya naś citra ā bhuvat* (IV, 31, 1ᵃ), (319ᵃ)
*kas tva satyo madanam* (IV, 31, 2ᵃ), (not in Bloomfield, 322ᵇ)

[1] In view of the variants in the MSS I have given only the first Padas All the verses are assumed to be quoted in full.

The following occur in the Śaṅkhāyana Āranyaka I, II, VII-XII

# INDEX II

## QUOTATIONS FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE RGVEDA, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(All the Padas of metrical passages are given as in Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* (*Harvard Oriental Series*, Vol. X, 1906) Metrical passages are marked (v) The references in brackets are to page and column of the *Concordance*)

*pṛthivyupardm Vārunavāyvistamam*, V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
*pṛ́śnimātarah Marutah svarkā́ḥ* (v), V, 1, 1 (605$^{b}$)
*prácetana prá cetaya* (v), IV, 1 (608$^{a}$)
*Prajā́patir ví dim brdhma* (v), V, 3, 1 (610$^{b}$)
*prati vam ṛjīri* (v), V, 2, 1 (618$^{a}$)
*prátistha hṛdayasya sárvam* (v), V, 3, 2 (not in Bloomfield)
*prábho jánasya Vṛtrahan* (v), IV, 1 (625$^{b}$).
*prá vo Índraya* (v), V, 2, 2 (628$^{b}$)
*pranam anuprenkhasva*, V, 1, 4 (635$^{b}$)
*pranā́ya tva (ullikhami)*, V, 1, 4 (637$^{a}$)
*premāṃ vacam vadisyami*, &c., V, 1, 5 (642$^{b}$, in the parallel passages from Lāṭyayana and Śaṅkhayana Bloomfield reads *svargam ayis yan* and *svargam isyan* respectively, I think wrongly), Ś I, 8 (with variants)

*barhatena tva (chandasoduhami)*, V, 1, 4 (348$^{a}$).
*brdhma prajā́m me dhuksva*, V, 3, 2 (658$^{b}$)
*brahmeva loke ksatram iva śriyam bhuyasam*, V, 1, 1 (661$^{a}$)

*bhuvo vā́janaṃ pátir vásoḥ ánu* (v), IV, 1 (670$^{b}$)
*bhutebhyas tva*, V, 1, 4 (671$^{b}$, 672$^{a}$)
*bhur bhuvah svar*, I, 3, 2, V, 1, 4 (674$^{b}$)
*bhū́r bhúvaḥ svàr trdyo vedo 'si*, V, 3, 2 (not separated in Bloomfield)

*mdmhistha Indra vijáro* (?) *grnádbhyas* (v), V, 2, 1 (676$^{b}$)
*mdmhistha vajrinn ṛñjáse* (v), IV, 1 (676$^{b}$)
*mdmhistho vā́jasataye* (v), V, 2, 2 (677$^{a}$, cf RV, VIII, 4, 18$^{d}$, 88, 6$^{d}$)
*mátsva mádaṃ puruvā́ram maghā́ya* (v), V, 2, 1 (678$^{b}$)
*mana ivapurvam vāyur iva ślokabhur bhuyasam*, V, 1, 1 (682$^{b}$)
*mayi kirtih*, V, 1, 5 (689$^{a}$)
*mayi ghosah* V, 1, 5 (689$^{a}$)
*mayi bhagah*, V, 1, 5 (689$^{b}$)
*mayi bhuktih*, V, 1, 5 (689$^{b}$).
*mayi bhuyah*, V, 1, 5 (689$^{b}$)
*mayi mahan*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*mayi yaśah*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*mayi trih*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*mayi ślokah*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*mayi stobhah*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*mayi stomah*, V, 1, 5 (690$^{a}$)
*murdhā́ lokā́nam asi* (v), V, 3, 2 (719$^{a}$, treated apparently as prose)

*yáḥ śáviṣṭhaḥ śū́raṇam* (v), IV, 1 (769$^{b}$)
*yaṃ tva śáviṣṭham imahe* (v), V, 2, 2 (762$^{a}$).
*yásyedám ardjat tújo yújo vánam sáhah* (v), V, 2, 1 (two Padas, in 777$^{a}$ the first Pāda is given, with the remark that the Aranyaka omits *yujah*, but the second Pada is not given under *yujah*).
*yújo vánam sáhah*, see preceding
*yé Agniṣvā́ttā uta va yájatrah* (v), V, 1, 1 (795$^{b}$)
*ye 3 yajamahe*, V, 3, 2 (804$^{b}$, without *pluti*)
*yó mdmhistho maghónam* (v), IV, 1 (811$^{b}$)

*rayíṃ piśáṅgasamdrśam* (v), V, 2, 1 (820$^{a}$, cf RV, II, 41, 9$^{b}$)
*rayí vā́jaya vajrivah* (v), IV, 1 (825$^{b}$)
*Rudras tvā traistubhena* &c, V, 1, 4 (828$^{b}$), Ś I, 7.

*lokám brahmavarcasám abhdyaṃ yajñasamṛddhim me dhuksva*, V, 3, 2 (832$^{b}$)

*vaśī́ hí Śakrdh*, IV, 1 (847$^{a}$)
*vaśī́ hí Śakró vásoḥ ánu*, IV, 1 (847$^{a}$)
*vasavas tva gayatrena* &c, V, 1, 4 (848$^{a}$), Ś I, 7.
*vāk*, V, 1, 5 (852$^{a}$)
*vag devi somasya trpyatu*, V, 5, 2 (853$^{a}$)
*Vayuh Pusā́ Varúnah Sómo Agnih* (v), V, 1, 1 (860$^{b}$)
*vidā́ maghavan vidā́ gatúm* (v), IV, 1 (867$^{a}$)
*vidā́ maghavan vidó3m*, IV, 1 (867$^{a}$)
*vidā́ rayáḥ suvī́ryam* (v), IV, 1 (867$^{a}$)
*vípra gathám gayata yáj jujosat* (v), V, 2, 2 (871$^{a}$)
*vi va asmāsu rajasi* (v), I, 4, 3 (not in Bloomfield, perhaps as not being considered a Mantra)
*viśudito davan vaśudito na ā́ bhara* (v), V, 2, 2 (879$^{a}$)
*viśvasya prastobha vidvā́n* (v), V, 2, 2 (881$^{a}$, where the whole line with *puro* is given as if one Pada)
*viśve tvā deva anustubhena* &c, V, 1, 4 (886$^{b}$)
*vyānam anuchikhasva*, V, 1, 4 (909$^{b}$, where the quotation is given as *anu cinkhasva*)
*vyanaya tvollikhami*, V, 1, 4 (909$^{b}$)

In the Śānti verses occur the following (see note on I, 1) (The accents are not given )

*van me manasi* &c , II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, $853^{b}$) Ś VII, 1
*vedasya ma anı sthah* II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, $903^{b}$) Cf Ś VII 1
*śiva nah śamtama bhava* (v) ($925^{a}$), Ś. VII, 1
*śrutam me ma prahasih*, II, 7 (not in Bloomfield, $940^{a}$)
*satyam vadisyami* II, 7 ($958^{b}$), Ś VII, 1
*sarvah sapranah sabala uttisthams* (v) (not in Bloomfield)
*sarvasyai vaca isana* (v) (Cf. supra.)
*sumrḍikā Sarasvati* (v), ($1020^{b}$), Ś VII, 1
*suryo jyotisam śresthah* (not in Bloomfield, but cf $40^{a}$), Ś VII, 1, IX, 1

In II, 3, 8 the following Ślokas occur

*tatra devah sarva ekam bhavanti*, $1^{d}$, $2^{d}$ ($391^{b}$)
*tatra devah sarvayujo bhavanti* $3^{d}$ ($391^{b}$)
*tad vipra kavayo n avindan* $3^{c}$ ($397^{a}$)
*tena papmanam apahatya brahmana*, $4^{c}$ ($438^{b}$)

*namayattah samatrpyati śrute 'dhi*, $3^{d}$ ($547^{a}$)
*nainam astripuman bruvan* $5^{b}$ ($559^{a}$)
*nainam vaca striyam bruvan* $5^{a}$ (559)

*pumamsam na bruvann enam* $5^{c}$ ($951^{b}$).

*yac casyah kruram yac colbanismi* $3^{b}$ ($736^{a}$)
*yad aksaram pañcavidham sameti* $1^{a}$ ($749^{a}$).
*yad aksarad aksaram iti yuktam*, $2^{a}$ ($749^{b}$)
*yad vaca om iti yac ca neti*, $3^{a}$ ($759^{b}$)
*yasmin nama samatrpyati śrute 'dhi*, $4^{c}$ ($773^{b}$)
*yujo yukta abhi yat samvahanti*, $1^{b}$, $2^{b}$ ($791^{a}$)

*vadan vadati kaścana*, $5^{d}$ ($835^{a}$)

*satyasya satyam anu yatra yujyate*, $1^{c}$, $2^{c}$ ($960^{a}$)
*svargam lokam apyeti vidvan*, $4^{d}$ ($1050^{b}$).

Prose formulae in Śankhayana Āranyaka I II VII–XIV (Most of these are not in Bloomfield, *Vedic Concordance*)

*annam granthih*, XI 8
*annam iva sthiro vasani vairajena chandasā*, XI 8
*annavan annado bhuyāsam* XI 6, 8
*apāne me vidyutah pratisthitah svaha* XI 5
*apane me vidyutah pratisthitā apano hrdaye*, XI 6
*aja iva sthiro vasani traistubhena chandasā*, XI 8
*arko 'si* Ś I 7 ($113^{b}$)
*aśmeva sthiro vasāni jāgatena chandasā* XI, 8

*atmani me brahma pratisthitam svaha*, XI, 5
*atmani ma brahma pratisthitam ātma hrdaye*, XI, 6

*udane me Parjanyah pratisthitah svahā* XI 5
*udane me Parjanyah pratisthita udano hrdaye*, XI, 6

*granthim udgrathāmi*, XI, 8

*caksusi ma Ādityah pratisthitah svahā* XI 5
*caksusi ma Ādityah pratisthitaś caksur hrdaye*, XI 6.

*tat satyam devanām* XI, 6, 8
*trptir iva sthiro vasāny ānustubhena chandasā*, XI 8

*naikam iva sthiro vasani sāmrajyena chandasā*, XI, 8
*puruso manih*, XI, 8
*Prajapatir iva sthiro vasany atichandasena chandasa* XI 8
*Prajapatis tvarohatu vayuh prenkhayatu*, I, 7
*pranah sutram*, XI 8
*prane me vāyuh pratisthitah svahā*, XI 5
*prane me vayuh pratisthito vayur hrdaye*, XI 6

*bale ma Indrah pratisthitah svāhā*, XI, 5
*bale ma Indrah pratisthito balam hrdaye* XI 6
*Brhaspatir iva sthiro vasani bārhatena chandasā* XI, 8
*Brahmeva sthiro vasani pāñktena chandasā* XI, 8

*manasi me candramah pratisthitah svāhā* XI, 5
*manasi me candramah pratisthito mano hrdaye*, XI 6
*manyau ma Īśanah pratisthitah svahā* XI, 5
*manyau ma Īśanah pratisthito manyur hrdaye*, XI 6
*māham akāmo mari yami* XI, 6, 8
*murdhani ma ākāśah pratisthitah svahā*, XI, 5
*mūrdhani ma ākaśah pratisthito murdhā hrdaye*, XI, 6

Verses other than Rgvedic in Sānkhayana Āranyaka I, II, VII XIV The references to XII and XIV are to verses (Several not in Bloomfield)

# INDEX III

## PROPER NAMES, EXCLUDING THOSE OF DEITIES, FOR WHICH SEE INDICES IV–VI.

The following other proper names occur in the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka.

# INDEX IV

## WORDS OCCURRING IN VERSES OTHER THAN RGVEDIC, NIVIDS, PRAISAS, ETC

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom or masc, unless otherwise specified Words are given in their forms *in pausa* Prefixes are connected with the verb, unless words intervene )

### A In Aitareya Āranyaka and parallel passages in Śāṅkhayana Āranyaka.

B In Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka and the Śānti verses in the Aitareya Āraṇyaka (A)

# INDEX V

## WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRAṆYAKAS I-III, OTHER THAN WORDS OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom or masc. unless otherwise specified See also p 344 As II 5 and 6 have no Khaṇḍas, the II is repeated where necessary to avoid ambiguity Parallel words in the Śaṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka I, II, VII-XIII are referred to as Ś)

## WORDS IN ŚĀNKHĀYANA ARANYAKA VII AND VIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN AITAREYA ĀRANYAKA III

## WORDS IN ŚAṄKHĀYANA ĀRAṆYAKA IX, X, XI, XII, 8, AND XIII WHICH ARE NOT FOUND IN AITAREYA ĀRAṆYAKA I–III (ĀRAṆYAKA IX IS MAINLY A REPETITION OF CHĀNDOGYA UPANIṢAD)

*aṅgirah* X 8 (acc.) X 8.
√*a-ls udañcat* XI 1 *aya* XI 4 XII 8 cf IX 8
*adhyatm kam* X 1
*anvāharyapa anah* X 1
*rparam* (nom neut not in Bṛhadāraṇyaka) XIII
*amrt kumbh h* II 5 19 XI 1
*aya* XI 7
*avāntarad śah* (nom.) X 6 (acc.) X 6 (instr) X 6
√*aś praśya* IX 8.
*aśma* XI 7

*jyaval am* (acc.) XI 5
*i yāhu ih* (acc XI 4.
*k nās am* XI
*an aram* X 1
*anīre* XI 2
*a d e nah* XII 8.

*l nah* XI 2 (acc.) XI 1

*n h am* (acc.) XI 8
*u. aram* (a1r) XII 8
*u a a ah* (w1 h abl XII 8
*u.dukam* (?) XII 8 n 8
*u prāvehanam* XI 4

*ṛ abhalrig graman m* (?), XII 8

*ekam ekay* XII 8.
*erand.man n* XII 8.

*kamse* XII 8.
*k n yam* IX 8
*k m* XI 4
*kumbhah see am ts°*
*k n yāh gen.)* XI 4
*k amumbhn andhinam* XI 4
*k amam* (?) (w h dat.) XI 1

*khad as am-m m* XII 4

*g h na pah* X 8.
*g dn* (acc XI 4

*ghrtaud ne* XII 8

*catasrbh h* XII 8
*caturth m* IX 8
*carman* XII 8

*janu* (acc.) XI 4 XII 8 cf. IX 8

*tīd h* X 8
*t laudane* XII 8
*trp h* XI 7
*ta labhyañgum* XI 4
*tvara ram* (adv ) XII 8

*d k nam* (acc neut.) XI 4 XII 8
*d. nlah* X 8 *dan n* XII 8
*daśat dhām* X 8.

√*dhā udhāsan ddh ty a* XI 4 XII 8
*dhūmah* X 8

*nadyah nad n* X [illegible]
*n.kam* XI [illegible]
√*nī samavan nīya* XI 5 6; 8.

*p n abh h* XII 8
*p y h* X 8 (loc.) XI 4
*pari n am* (v l *su*?) XI 1
*p nduradarśanam* XI 4
*p p gham* IX 2
*p n āmanah* XI 1
*pra ad graman m* XII 8
*pratyrcam* XII 8

√*badh badhn yāt* XII 8.
*b ha patih* XI 7
*bas ham* XII 8
*brahmaya tan ghah* XIII 1

*bha mani* X 8
*bhu himah* XII 8

*man m* XII 8
*m dhu arpsah* XII, 8
*manyuh* X 8 (loc.) XI 2
*mah suroha ya rah* ? XII 8
*m. m and n* XII, 8

## RARE WORDS IN ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I, II[1]



[1] For Aranyaka III-VI see Jacob's *Concordance* Buhler, *Z D M G*, XLVIII, 63, compares with *paraśvan*, III, 2, Pali *palasate* (Aśoka's Pillar Edict, V) and *palasada* (Jāt, V, 406, v 267), 'rhinoceros.' For *vijara nadī*, III, 3, cf Hopkins, *J A O S*, XXVI, 56, on III, 1 sq, see Windisch, *Sachs Ber*, 1907, pp. 111 sq., *Buddha's Geburt*, pp 63 sq., 71 sq

# INDEX VI

## WORDS OCCURRING IN ĀRANYAKA V, AND IN THE PARALLEL PASSAGES OF ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I AND II, OTHER THAN THOSE OCCURRING IN QUOTATIONS.

(When the case or gender is ambiguous, it is nom or masc unless otherwise specified. The words noted as occurring in quotations might also be classed in Index IV, but are of a slightly different type.)

# INDEX VII

## BEGINNINGS OF KHANDAS OF ĀRANYAKAS

## PRATĪKAS IN ŚĀNKHĀYANA ĀRANYAKA I, II, VII–XV.

# VIII. INDEX TO INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

(Only the more important points are here referred to. References to the Introduction are to pages, to the Notes to the Āranyakas.)



[1] What is given in the Introduction is not repeated in the Index

OXFORD
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, M A
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY